# THE Lutheran Quarterly

*ne XI* FEBRUARY, 1959 *Number 1*

CBPL

v.11
1959

Office of Publication, 18 Carlisle Street, Gettysburg, Pa. Entered at the Post Office at Gettysburg, Pa., as second-class matter under the act of March 3, 1879.

Published quarterly by the Editorial Council of Lutheran Theological Seminaries and continuing *The Lutheran Quarterly,* founded in Gettysburg as *The Evangelical Review* in 1849, *The Lutheran Church Review,* founded in Philadelphia in 1882, *The Lutheran Church Quarterly,* Philadelphia and Gettysburg since 1928, and *The Augustana Quarterly,* Rock Island, Illinois, since 1922.

Printed by the Times and News Publishing Company, Gettysburg, Pa.

Manuscripts should be addressed to the Editor, books for review to the Book Editor, subscriptions to the Circulation Manager.

Subscription $2.75 a year in advance; single copies 75 cents.

*Editor*
THEODORE G. TAPPERT
7333 Germantown Ave., Philadelphia 19, Pennsylvania

*Managing Editor*
A. J. ENGELBRECHT
1250 Nowata St., Dubuque, Iowa

*Book Editor*
ARNOLD E. CARLSON
Augustana Theological Seminary, Rock Island, Illinois

*Circulation Manager*
LOWELL J. SATRE
Luther Theological Seminary, St. Paul 8, Minnesota

## EDITORIAL COUNCIL

Representatives of

Lutheran Theological Seminary
Gettysburg, Pa.

Lutheran Theological Seminary
Philadelphia, Pa.

Augustana Theological Seminary
Rock Island, Ill.

Capital University Theological Seminary
Columbus, Ohio

Wartburg Theological Seminary
Dubuque, Iowa

Luther Theological Seminary
St. Paul, Minn.

Augsburg Seminary
Minneapolis, Minn.

Central Seminary
Fremont, Neb.

Chicago Lutheran Seminary
Maywood, Ill.

Evangelical Lutheran Seminary of Canada
Waterloo, Ont.

Grandview Seminary
Des Moines, Iowa

Hamma Divinity School
Springfield, Ohio

Lutheran Seminary
Saskatoon, Sask.

Northwestern Lutheran Seminary
Minneapolis, Minn.

Southern Lutheran Seminary
Columbia, S. C.

Suomi Seminary
Hancock, Mich.

Trinity Seminary
Dubuque, Iowa

Pacific Lutheran Seminary
Berkeley, Calif.

## AIMS AND POLICY

I. *Aim:* The aim of this quarterly shall be to provide a forum (1) for the discussion of Christian faith and life on the basis of the Lutheran confession, (2) for the application of the principles of the Lutheran Church to the changing problems of religion and society, (3) for the fostering of world Lutheranism, and (4) for the promotion of understanding between Lutherans and other Christians.

II. *Policy:* The editors will welcome contributions that are likely to be helpful in the furtherance of the aims set forth above. It will be required of such contributions that they be frank and fair in their discussion of moot questions; that they be free from controversial animus; and that their contents be of real scholarly and practical value to the readers. Difference of opinion between contributors, or between a contributor and the editors, does not of itself exclude articles from publication since the editors do not hold themselves responsible for the opinions of contributors.

# THE LUTHERAN QUARTERLY

Volume XI February, 1959 Number 1

## CONTENTS

THE PROTESTANT MINISTER IN AMERICAN FICTION ..... *Gilbert P. Voigt* 1

GRACE AND LIFE WITHOUT GRACE IN ERNEST HEMINGWAY ... *Hanns Lilje* 14

LUTHERAN SEPARATION—THE OHIO STORY ..... *Willard D. Allbeck* 28

THE DEBATE BETWEEN ECK AND MELANCHTHON ON ORIGINAL SIN AT THE COLLOQUY OF WORMS ..... *Heinz Mackensen* 42

DID PAUL TURN HIS BACK ON THE JEWS FOREVER? ... *Kurt Carl Hartmann* 57

THE LUTHERAN CHURCH IN THE CAROLINAS SOCIOLOGICALLY INTERPRETED ..... *Wade F. Hook* 60

BOOK REVIEWS AND NOTICES

Jacob, *The Theology of the Old Testament* (C. A. Anderson) ..... 68
Gordon, *The World of the Old Testament* (George E. Mendenhall) ..... 69
Williams, *The Acts of the Apostles* (Robert A. Bartels) ..... 70
Bring, *Galaterbrevet* (Edgar M. Carlson) ..... 70
Elliot-Binns, *Galilean Christianity* (Harry J. Mumm) ..... 71
Kenyon, *Our Bible and the Ancient Manuscripts* (A. J. Engelbrecht) ..... 73
Marks & Rogers, *A Beginner's Handbook to Biblical Hebrew* (Victor R. Gold) ..... 74
Rowley, ed., *Eleven Years of Bible Bibliography* ..... 75
Bultmann, *The Presence of Eternity* (Martin J. Heinecken) ..... 75
Tillich, *Systematic Theology. Volume II: Existence and the Christ* ..... 76
Bornkamm, *Luther's World of Thought* (E. Clifford Nelson) ..... 78
Hyma, *New Light on Martin Luther With An Authentic Account of the Luther Film of 1953* (E. Clifford Nelson) ..... 79
Petry, ed., *Late Medieval Mysticism* (Frederick K. Wentz) ..... 79
Rupp, *Six Makers of English Religion* (Harold H. Ditmanson) ..... 80
Lindström, *Efferföljelsens teologi hos Sören Kierkegaard* (Paul L. Holmer) ..... 81
Lehmann, ed., *Alte Briefe aus Indien. Unveröffentlichte Briefe von Bartholomäus Ziegenbalg, 1706-1719* (Theodore G. Tappert) ..... 82
Niemöller, ed., *Texte zur Geschichte des Pfarrernotbundes* (Wayne Wonderley) ..... 83
Marsh, *A Year With the Bible* (Robert W. Larsen) ..... 83
Strong, *Old Testament Portraits* (J. M. Myers) ..... 84
Hershberger, *The Way of the Cross in Human Relations* (E. H. Wahlstrom) ..... 84
Bovet, *Love, Skill and Mystery* (Paul M. Lindberg) ..... 85
Templeton, *Evangelism for Tomorrow* (A. S. Tanner) ..... 86
Ward, *Creative Giving* (Henry H. Bagger) ..... 86
Shepherd, *The Liturgy and the Christian Faith* (Gerhard M. Cartford) ..... 87
Ladd, *Prayer Book Interleaves* (Gerhard M. Cartford) ..... 87
Davies, *Christian Worship, Its History and Meaning* (Gerhard M. Cartford) ..... 88

PACIFIC LUTHERAN
THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
LIBRARY

# CONTRIBUTORS

GILBERT P. VOIGT, professor of English and American Literature for many years in Wittenberg and Newberry Colleges, now lives in retirement in Nashville, Tennessee.

The study by HANNS LILJE, bishop of Hanover, Germany, was translated into English by EDWARD A. JOHNSON, pastor of the Dongola parish (U.L.C.A.), Dongola, Illinois.

WILLARD D. ALLBECK is professor of Historical Theology in Hamma Divinity School, Springfield, Ohio.

HEINZ MACKENSEN is professor of History on the Teaneck, New Jersey, campus of Farleigh Dickinson University.

WADE F. HOOK is pastor of the Church of the Holy Trinity in Chapel Hill, North Carolina, and ministers to students in the University of North Carolina.

KURT CARL HARTMANN is pastor of Immanuel Church (A.L.C.) in La Vernia, Texas.

Among the reviewers of books in this number are ROBERT A. BARTELS, professor of the New Testament in Northwestern Lutheran Theological Seminary, Minneapolis, Minnesota; GERHARD M. CARTFORD, instructor in Church Music in Luther Seminary, St. Paul, Minnesota; HAROLD H. DITMANSON, professor of Religion in St. Olaf College, Northfield, Minnesota; MARTIN J. HEINECKEN, professor of Systematic Theology in the Philadelphia Lutheran Seminary, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania; PAUL L. HOLMER, associate professor of Philosophy in the University of Minnesota; PAUL M. LINDBERG, professor of Christian Education in Augustana Theological Seminary, Rock Island, Illinois; GEORGE E. MENDENHALL, a member of the Department of Near Eastern Studies in the University of Michigan; HARRY J. MUMM, professor of New Testament in Pacific Lutheran Seminary; JACOB M. MYERS, professor of Old Testament in the Lutheran Theological Seminary, Gettysburg, Pennsylvania; E. CLIFFORD NELSON, professor of Church History in Luther Seminary, St. Paul, Minnesota; ERIC H. WAHLSTROM, professor of New Testament in Augustana Theological Seminary; HENRY H. BAGGER, president of the Philadelphia Lutheran Seminary; EDGAR M. CARLSON, president of Gustavus Adolphus College, St. Peter, Minnesota; VICTOR R. GOLD, associate professor of the Old Testament in Pacific Lutheran Seminary; HERBERT LEUPOLD, professor of the Old Testament in Capital University Theological Seminary, Columbus, Ohio; FREDERICK K. WENTZ, professor of Historical Theology in the Lutheran Theological Seminary, Gettysburg.



1 6879

# The Protestant Minister in American Fiction

By Gilbert P. Voigt

THIS STUDY was suggested some years ago by the editor of this periodical. It attempts to show, first, the extent to which the Protestant minister is treated in American fiction and, then, the various ways or kinds of ministers the authors commend and the kinds they dislike.

It is surprising to discover how many Protestant clergymen are found in our novels and short stories. I have discovered fifty in fiction that deserves to be called literary; in non-literary stories there are others. Some of the fifty I have found are creations of leading writers of fiction: Nathaniel Hawthorne, Herman Melville, Mark Twain, William Dean Howells, Sinclair Lewis, and Willa Cather.

There are a number of our novels and short stories in which a Protestant minister is the chief character. Such are Hawthorne's *Scarlet Letter* and "The Minister's Black Veil," Harriet Beecher Stowe's *The Minister's Wooing,* Thomas Nelson Page's *John Marvel, Assistant,* Harold Frederic's *The Damnation of Theron Ware,* Margaret Deland's *John Ward, Preacher,* and *Dr. Lavender's People,* Elizabeth S. Phelps Ward's *A Singular Life,* Albion Tourgee's *Murvale Eastman, Christian Socialist,* George W. Cable's *Bylow Hill* and "Posson Jone,'" Sinclair Lewis' *Elmer Gantry* and *The God-Seeker,* Ellen Glasgow's *Vein of Iron,* Margaret Widdemer's *A Minister of Grace,* Edward Everett Hale's "My Double and How He Undid Me."

As for denominations, Methodist and Episcopal clergymen are most numerous; but there are also Baptists, Congregationalists, Presbyterians, and four Lutherans. These four will next be considered somewhat in detail.

Two of the Lutheran ministers are admirable; one is unworthy; the fourth is humorous. Admirable, first, is O. E. Rolvaag's itinerant Norwegian minister on the Dakota frontier in the novel *Giants in the Earth*—"a wonderful man" he seems to the immigrant farmers there. A powerful preacher, he is also a "sympathetic and understanding pastor." Even when conducting divine service in a crude frontier home

he dons his canonicals and chants the liturgy. The Lord's Supper, which he administers to the immigrants long without it, brings peace of heart and mind to a homesick, conscience-stricken wife who has been intermittently demented. He plans to organize a congregation among these frontiersmen.

Likewise appealing is the humble, unselfish, and benevolent Lutheran pastor among the Swedish villagers in Colonial Delaware found in James K. Paulding's *Koningsmarke*. Though gentle and forbearing, he does not hesitate to rebuke idleness. To the sick, the dying, the afflicted he is a faithful minister; yet he also joins in the innocent amusements of his flock. He makes of the village a virtuous and happy community. The unworthy opposite of this pastor is his predecessor: a selfish, bigoted, straight-laced bachelor who looked well to his own comfort but gave nothing to the needy. To be sure, he organized benevolent societies which he persuaded to give assistance to the poor, but he allowed these to be abused by lazy villagers. A sour kill-joy, he denounced all innocent forms of amusement, even those of children; indeed, he preached hell-fire for those who "dared to be happy." The good things that came to his parishioners he pronounced a reward for their going to church and honoring their pastor. He took the married women away from their children and their housework into religious meetings.

The fourth Lutheran minister is used for farcical satire by Christopher Morley in his *Swiss Family Manhattan*. A Swiss preacher, he has quit the ministery to accept a position in the secretariat of the League of Nations in Geneva. On a trip he and his family take to the United States they have amusing experiences. But he falls in love with our country and decides to open a League of Nations gasoline station on Long Island.

Most of the ministers portrayed in American fiction fall into certain types or classes. One of the most prominent types is that of the minister to the poor and needy. An admirable example of such a man is John Marvel in Thomas Nelson Page's *John Marvel, Assistant*. The awkward, near-sighted assistant rector of a fashionable city congregation, he has been placed in charge of a mission maintained by this church in the poorest section of the city. His unwavering faith in the wisdom and goodness of God gives him a big heart full of trust in the redeemability of human nature. His sympathy with the poor, the sick,

the outcast, and the despairing is deep and unselfish. In order to rescue a poor battered girl being held in a brothel, he does not hesitate to enter the house of ill fame. His sincere sympathy and his goodness lend power to his simple, direct, and touching sermons and make of his life a convincing sermon. He is plodding, patient, and zealous. With the aid of a Jewish socialist—a rather far-fetched touch—he fills his chapel, his neighborhood-house, and his night school. But the rector of the fashionable church resents his having the Jew speak from his pulpit and asks for his resignation. When, however, his parishioners beg him not to leave them, he consents to remain, but only after the mission has been taken over by a congregation whose rector is "less fashionable but more spiritual" than his first chief. Even when he receives a call to an important parish, he decides to remain with his needy flock out of a sense of duty and a realization of opportunity.

Another Christlike minister to the poor and the outcast is Emanuel Bayard, the hero of Elizabeth S. Phelps Ward's *A Singular Life*. A sort of Father Taylor, he becomes the heroic and beloved minister to the fishermen in a small New England port and to the outcasts there. Handsome and well dressed—he had a high-born, wealthy mother—he is also very intelligent. Though once an oarsman at Harvard, he now has a weak lung. As evidence of his considerate self-denial, while in theological seminary he denied himself comforts that his needy fellow-students could not afford. When called by a congregation in the fishing port, he is refused ordination because of a flaw in his theology. Whereupon the poor people in the congregation withdraw and establish a mission in a once disreputable dance hall on the waterfront. They make Bayard the pastor of their church of the Love of Christ. He works among the drunkards and the prostitutes of the waterfront. He becomes known for his brave and noble deeds, especially the saving of a fisherman from his wrecked boat. He attacks the rum shops and brings about the closing of some of them. In retaliation, the liquor interest sets fire to his church plant. But he is able to rebuild it and continues to deliver quiet, finished, but persuasive sermons. His salary is meager and irregularly paid; hence his dress becomes shabby. His reclaiming of the soul of a prostitute leads to scandal, but this is in time overcome. In the end, however, he comes to an untimely death at the hands of a liquor dealer who has a personal grudge against him.

Albion W. Tourgee pictures in his *Murvale Eastman, Christian*

*Socialist* a minister of a wealthy congregation who, in his attempt to discover whether or not the church can really help the needy in "a truly Christian spirit," establishes a League of Christian Socialists. He works incognito as an employee of the local street railway. Later, when one of his fellow-workers on the street railway contracts tuberculosis, he does the man's work for him and takes the invalid into his home. Moreover, he befriends a widow of questionable social status; and when her name is cleared, he marries her. A wealthy girl in his congregation, who has jilted him, he eventually wins to the support of his League.

A second type of minister commended by our fictionists is the wise, understanding, and sympathetic pastor-counselor. Two of these are noteworthy. The one is Margaret Deland's well-known Dr. Lavender, who appears in her *Dr. Lavender's People* and her *Old Chester Tales.* The aged rector of a small-town Episcopal congregation, he is a wise and sympathetic, but unobtrusive and even reluctant, counselor of his people. His heart is bowed down with sorrow and pain by their misfortunes and their sins. Yet he remains happy and witty, never despairing of any one's salvation, for he holds that no human child of God can be "so very bad, after all." In spite of the meager income he has, he gives to the poor readily. Crotchety at times, he scorns modern methods of church work along with impersonal charity. Indeed, he calls himself "a dogmatic old fogy who preaches old sermons." On principle, he refuses to accept clerical discounts from merchants. Though a confirmed bachelor—it has been noted that some of the best-drawn ministers in fiction are bachelors—he regards marriage as the civilizer of mankind. Because he has no children of his own, he has deep sympathy with waifs. To prevent injustice on one occasion, he commits a legal crime and lies without hesitation. He feels that it is the lot of ministers and physicians to bear the sin and folly of mankind.

Like Dr. Lavender, Margaret Widdemer's Dr. Andrew Blanton in her novel, *A Minister of Grace,* is an admirable, lovable pastor and counselor. Like Dr. Lavender, furthermore, he is a bachelor and a rector of an Episcopal church in a small community. His sermons are far from interesting: they are long and rambling, full of old anecdotes and literary allusions, for he has once been a scholarly but pedantic professor in a university, of which he is now a trustee. But as a pastor and counselor he is magnificent: a sweetly sympathetic and saintly servant of the poor and the sick, whose souls he tries to save. On one

occasion he even spends three weeks in the home of a Negro family afflicted with smallpox and mortally afraid of hospitals. At the same time he rebukes sin with fearless frankness; his is the stern wisdom of a fearless "shepherd of souls." Yet he remains thoroughly human: he sets great store by humor, even in time of trouble; old as he is, he can still admire a woman's beauty.

Now and then a theologian appears in our fiction, as in *A Singular Life,* in which a professor of theology's absorption in theological problems is mildly satirized. But admirable is Harriet Beecher Stowe's pastor-theologian, "Dr. H.," in her novel *The Minister's Wooing.* With his power of subtle analysis and his habit of independent thinking, he constructs a new system of theology, which he publishes in book form. To his Newport, Rhode Island, congregation he delivers unattractive, doctrinal sermons not to their liking. Moreover, his belief in absolute self-denial and complete surrender to the will of God is so lofty an ideal that ordinary people find it discouraging. His courageous sense of duty, made strong by "years of constant discipline and self-vigilance," leads him to speak out boldly against slavery, even though he thereby offends a wealthy slave-trader who pays half his salary. At all times he is a calm witness against popular sins and a preacher of unpopular truths, regardless of expediency or material gain. But he is an excellent pastor, doing good to his fellowmen, especially the poor, the bereaved, the oppressed. Humble, pure, unworldly, he is helpless in the practical affairs of the world. The title of the novel refers to his surprising wooing and winning of a beautiful, godly young woman, the daughter of his housekeeper. But when he learns that her childhood lover, thought dead at sea, has appeared in Newport, he magnanimously releases her from her engagement to himself. Later he marries another woman and lives to a ripe old age, remaining to the end a "steady, undiscouraged worker" for the establishment of the kingdom of God on earth.

Another pastor-theologian drawn by Mrs. Stowe in her *Oldtown Folks* commands respect, if not love. "Austere, inflexible, indifferent to all things earthly," he is a hard student of theology and an independent Calvinist who has become an influential theologian, whose reputation has drawn to him young students of theology. Artless and gentle, indifferent to money, he supplements his small salary with income from a farm he operates. Despising popularity and inflexibly set against sin, he spares no one in his preaching and consequently drives some of his

listeners out of the church. But such opposition he welcomes as evidence of a faithful ministry. One Sunday, when he notices that many of his listeners are asleep, he walks out of the church and refuses to return until the sleepers have apologized and have promised better conduct. No wonder all the townsfolk fear him and look up to him, for his word is law.

Foreign missionaries do not always fare well at the hands of our writers of fiction. To be sure, in his *Omoo* Herman Melville credits them with hard work, conscientious devotion, improving the morality of the indolent South Sea Islanders, and giving the natives the Bible in their own tongue. Moreover, Ellen Glasgow in her *Barren Ground* speaks well of two returned missionaries from abroad. One of them has been forced to return from the Congo because of ill health and now does evangelistic work with a Gospel wagon. The other, once in the Orient, sets free the slaves on his ante bellum plantation in Virginia and gives the proceeds to missionary work. An eloquent preacher, a learned theologian, sincerely pious, he establishes a Presbyterian congregation. On the other hand, Melville accuses foreign missionaries of occasional selfishness, of poor judgment, and of segregation of their children from the natives. And Frank Stockton in his humorous novel, *The Casting Away of Mrs. Lecks and Mrs. Aleshine,* pictures a missionary returning from the Orient as self-centered, fretful, complaining, and close-fisted. Moreover, Wilbur Daniel Steele in his short story, "The Man who Saw Through Heaven," shows how a Fundamentalist, about to set out for Africa, is given the opportunity to look through a large telescope and is so awed by the immensity of the universe that he goes mad. He goes through Africa making clay images of God, but on his deathbed he returns to his faith in the heavenly Father who frowns on idolatry.

Protestant missionaries to the American Indians are found at times in American novels. James Fenimore Cooper in his *Oak-Openings* pays tribute to a pious, devoted Methodist missionary, a man of "singular simplicity of character," who commands the respect of the Indians. When captured by a group of them on the war-path and put to death, his dying prayer for them so shakes the soul of a chief, who has already come under the influence of a Christian frontierswoman, that the red man becomes a humble, devout Christian, eager to follow the precepts of the Bible. William Gilmore Simms' missionary to the

Indians on the southwestern border of South Carolina, in *The Yemassee,* is a sincere man of God and a friend of the exploited Yemassees. But he is also a bigoted, intolerant Puritan father. In his novel *The God-Seeker* Sinclair Lewis satirizes two contrasting missionaries to the Sioux. The one, once a prosperous lawyer, is ill-tempered, impatient, impolite, full of "Presbyterian pomposity." He frowns on even light laughter as sinful. The Indians he regards as degenerate heathen, who must be brought to the mourners' bench "screaming for mercy." Yet he is earnest, faithful, and courageous. His colleague, whom he dislikes, is a scholarly man who is the linguist and acting physician of the mission as well as a preacher. His sermons are brief, simple, and airy. He is an earnest, amiable worker. But at the same time he is condescendingly proud of his superior education, crafty, and given to "pussycat smiles."

For the pastors of fashionable churches and the ministers who are money-raisers in their congregations our writers of fiction have little respect. One of these is Melville's Rev. Mr. Falsgrave in his strange novel, *Pierre*. This pastor has a fine physique—Thomas Nelson Page once wrote that the prime requisite of the successful minister to a fashionable congregation is good looks—and is highly intelligent, well-mannered, and tactful. He is also an eloquently persuasive preacher. But he is so entangled in worldly alliances that he cannot give "earnest and world-disdaining counsel" on points of ethics. Thus he becomes a "helpless and unhelping" pastor. Thomas Nelson Page's rector of a fashionable church in *John Marvel, Assistant* sacrifices spirituality to organizing ability and skill in raising money. He believes the power of money to be unlimited. T. S. Stribling's minister of a Methodist congregation in an Alabama boom town wishes to build a cathedral-like sanctuary—hence the title of the novel, *Unfinished Cathedral*—and becomes an avid money-raiser who hopes to obtain contributions even from the godless. His spiritually minded assistant learns to his disappointment that the pastor of a large congregation is expected to be a money-raiser and is in time called to a city congregation that wants its minister to be a good preacher of a diluted theology and a skillful gatherer of funds. More worthy of respect is the rector of a rich congregation in Robert Grant's *The Undercurrent*. Handsome, businesslike, and wise, he tries to be a man of the world in order to be a more useful man of God. An eloquent, practical preacher of liberal theology,

he tries to make of his congregation a brotherhood of rich and poor. But, finding this difficult, he is content to establish a mission for the poor. Though he dislikes the increasing wealth and the self-indulgence of the wealthy, he resignedly decides to make the best of the situation and to indulge his fondness for beauty of symbol and color in worship.

Occasionally an actual minister, a historical figure, is found in our fiction. Cotton Mather appears in two novels dealing with the witchcraft delusion in colonial Salem. In J. W. De Forest's *Witching Times* he is an oligarch, not sure of the reality of witchcraft but using the hysteria to strengthen the rule of the clergy in Massachusetts. In John Neal's *Rachel Dyer* he is a subordinate character; the hero is another minister who struggles manfully against the hysteria but is executed. In his novel *The Circuit Rider* Edward Eggleston uses incidentally Bishop Francis Asbury.

Several of our fictional clergymen are picturesque figures. George W. Cable's giant backwoods preacher in "Posson Jone' " comes to New Orleans one day early in the nineteenth century with a large sum of church money. An unscrupulous gambler makes him drunk and tries in vain to rob him. Arrested for disorderly conduct in public, the parson is thrown into jail. Here his penitence is so touching and his forgiving prayer for the would-be-swindler so Christlike that the gambler is converted into an honest man. Melville's venerable and saintly minister to Massachusetts whalemen, called affectionately by them Father Mapple, preaches from a high pulpit, entered by a rope ladder and shaped like the bow of a ship, in the nautical lingo he had learned when a whaler. Mary N. Murfree's preacher in *The Prophet of the Great Smoky Mountains,* who is believed to have mysterious foreknowledge of future events, is ignorant of all books but the Bible, but well-versed in human nature. Once the companion of bold, evil men, he has been converted to Christianity through a tragedy in his family. But unable to overcome certain religious doubts, he finally confesses these at a church service and is put out of the church. Moreover, he is arrested on a false charge. When released by the sheriff, he becomes furiously vindictive, disappears, and goes to his death.

Edward Eggleston's frontier preachers in his *Circuit Rider* deserve mention. One, a former gambler, is a successful revivalist and circuit rider because of his eloquence and his skill in story-telling. A born fighter who loves a struggle, he fights evil and poverty. Moreover,

when ruffians try to break up a camp meeting, he puts them to flight with the aid of church people. In time he becomes a presiding elder. Quite different is another frontier pastor, a frail young victim of tuberculosis, famous for his piety. Although he is paid a mere pittance for his ministerial services, he gladly makes this and other sacrifices for his Master. In spite of his strictly limited energy, he is "tireless in labor, . . . bold in rebuking sin, and triumphant in death."

Unhappily a number of the Protestant ministers in our fiction prove unworthy of their high office. Three become guilty of illicit love. The most noted of these is Nathaniel Hawthorne's Arthur Dimmesdale, the eloquent and revered young minister in *The Scarlet Letter*. By nature pious, wise, and zealous, he is also passionate. In the course of his genuine love affair with a full-blooded, beautiful young woman, Hester Prynne, the victim of an enforced unnatural marriage, he falls into fornication. The husband of the young wife, is a much older and deformed man who has sent her on to Boston and has not been heard from for two years. Hester refuses to name the minister as the father of her illegitimate child and he lacks the moral courage to confess his share of the guilt. He fears he will shock his parishioners who regard him as a saint. But his agonizing remorse, his longing to confess, and the prolonged torture he endures from the vindictive husband who has appeared in Boston, render him pitiable rather than contemptible.

E. W. Howe's preacher-farmer-editor in *The Story of a Country Town* is a grave, quiet Methodist minister, given to reflection but restless and fond of money. He quits the pulpit and becomes editor of a small-town newspaper. He becomes infatuated with an unworthy woman and elopes with her, leaving his loyal wife to long forgivingly for his return. Soon remorseful, he quits the woman and roams the countryside. In time he returns to his home just too late to be reunited with his dying wife. He receives his son's forgiveness, then sets out again on his wanderings.

Harold Frederic's young Methodist minister in *The Damnation of Theron Ware* is at first innocent, pious, and good-hearted, married to a good and faithful wife. But he becomes infatuated with a beautiful, wealthy, and cultured girl who is irreligious. He now tires of his wife, conceives a dislike for Methodist doctrine and methods, and proudly looks down on his uncultured parishioners. Following the instructions of a fraudulent evangelist with a genius for organization, he becomes

a showman in the pulpit. When the girl with whom he is infatuated takes a trip to New York City, he follows her, misappropriating funds belonging to his congregation to cover the expense of his trip. But she rebuffs him as a bore and rebukes him for the loss of his former innocence. He now takes to drinking, quits the ministry, goes into business in Seattle, and hopes that his ability as a speaker will carry him far in politics.

Even more contemptible is Sinclair Lewis' Elmer Gantry in the novel of that name. Profane, dishonest, lustful, and insincere, but overweeningly ambitious, he is an utterly unworthy minister of the Gospel. After he has been expelled from a Baptist theological seminary, he is taken up by a Methodist bishop and given a start up the ladder of prominence in that denomination. This ladder he climbs by means of an athletic physique, pulpit eloquence, sensational methods, and shrewd publicity-seeking. In the end he is pastor of a church in New York City and also executive secretary of the National Association for the Purification of Art and the Press.

The occasional imposter among Protestant clergymen is represented in our fiction by the Rev. James Dillingham in Thomas Bailey Aldrich's *Prudence Palfrey*. A handsome man of manly bearing, possessing a brilliant and well-trained mind, a good speaker, he attracts people by means of his tactful modesty, his gentle and affectionate manner, and his cheerful spirit. Even though he poses as a wealthy Southern aristocrat, he seeks a wealthy wife. Though he becomes the regular pastor of a congregation in a New England seaport, he one day disappears. It is then discovered that he is a fraud who has cribbed his sermons from printed collections of others. He worked his way into the New England church by bewitching one of its wealthy members whom he has met in New York City.

For one reason or another a few of the Protestant ministers in our fiction are pitiable. Most notable among these is the bachelor in Hawthorne's short story "The Minister's Black Veil." Like an ancient Hebrew prophet, he becomes a voluntary martyr. For in order to make a powerful appeal to the secret sinners in his community, he wears constantly a black veil, the awesome symbol of secret sin. This veil segregates him from his fellowmen, even from his fiancée. But, despite agonizing loneliness, he wears the veil until his death. Just before he dies he explains its significance. A second pitiable minister is Mar-

aret Deland's strictly orthodox Presbyterian in her novel, *John Ward, reacher.* A conscientious pastor, a warm friend of the needy, a re-ıarkably gentle comforter of the sorrowful, he is loved, and feared, y the whole town in which he ministers. Unhappily his wife is a ceptic who in private repudiates the fundamental doctrines of his hurch and publicly announces her disbelief in the damnation of the nbaptized. Ward's conscientious zeal leads him to feel that he must onvert her, but he hesitates to press his efforts. When the session of is congregation threatens to rebuke her, he presents her with an ltimatum: either accept the doctrines of his church or separate from im. Another pathetic preacher is Mark Twain's clergyman in "The Man Who Corrupted Hadleyburg." When he is about to be ridden n a rail by his enraged fellow townsmen for a deed he did not commit, certain layman who knows he is innocent fears to proclaim his in-ocence but does advise him to leave town for a while. Later, when the ıyman is about to be exposed as dishonest, the preacher gratefully rotects him by means of a lie.

One or two examples of other types of ministers are found in our ction: the army chaplain in Constance Woolson's *Anne;* the slandered astor in Margaret Widdemer's *Minister of Grace;* the field secretary or a church college in Ruth Suckow's *Bonney Family;* the war-monger-ıg preacher in Ellen Glasgow's *Vein of Iron;* the editor of a religious eriodical in Rachel Field's *All This and Heaven Too;* an extreme ealot for foreign missions in Mary E. Wilkins Freeman's *Love of Parson Lord;* the jealous husband in George W. Cable's *Bylow Hill;* Villa Cather's favorite of the women in his congregation in *The Song f the Lark;* the aged minister asked to resign in Thomas Bailey Ald-ich's *Prudence Palfrey;* the scholarly minister in Edward Everett Iale's "My Double and How He Undid Me," who to escape the in-onsequential public functions he is expected to attend employs a double vith startling and amusing consequences.

To summarize the findings of this study as to the ministerial traits ur writers of fiction admire and those they disparage: they minimize iturgy, organizing ability, pulpit oratory, and, on the whole, even heological learning; they magnify sincerity, unselfish concern for the oor and the outcast, fearless denunciation of evil from the pulpit, and vise, sympathetic counsel to the erring and the perplexed.

# Grace and Life Without Grace in Ernest Hemingway

By Hanns Lilje[1]

WHAT would be the significance of divine grace if it no longer had any meaning in a world in which Ernest Hemingway lives, writes, and is read or if it were already established, as a matter of course, that there can be no such thing as divine grace in that hard and to all appearances fascinating world? Since it is not a sign of intellectual integrity to start off with a preconceived opinion, we are not permitted to start from some tacit presupposition, for then we would be joining together in our theme two incompatible objects. It is evident that we must be fully aware of the perilous aspect of such a combination. Two intellectual dangers always underlie such an attempt. However great may be the danger of assuming the incompatibility of such worlds because of a foolish bias and therefore avoiding any real consideration of our problem, the danger also is great that we shall come forth with a hasty apologetic, born of snap judgment, and either call Hemingway on the carpet for things for which he neither can be nor wants to be called on the carpet, or that we speak of divine grace in such a weak and worthless manner as to make it seem sorely in need of being made perceptible and plausible by those who hold modern literary prizes.

Here only one thing helps: painstaking intellectual observation and honest, precise cerebration. For Hemingway is still one of those "points of crystallization" upon which the collective intellectual destiny of an entire generation focuses. The question whether the light of divine grace is missing in his world or whether, from that world's standpoint, it must be regarded as an hallucination is already a staggering question. For we are inevitably dealing with the question whether there can be any such thing in our world as faith in the Christian sense, or whether we ought to retire from the field with an attitude of heroic this-worldliness.

1 Translated by Edward A. Johnson from *Zeitwende, Die Neue Furche,* July, 1953.

## I

Ernest Hemingway's literary work is a magnificent heritage. The rch of his literary accomplishments spans a wide area. *The Sun Also Rises* was published as early as 1926; his last book, *The Old Man and he Sea,* which rose rapidly to best-seller status all over the world, ap-eared in 1952. In between lies the book about the Spanish Civil War, *For Whom the Bell Tolls,* which first appeared in March, 1941, and vhich in many ways represents the peak of Hemingway's creative ac-omplishments. If we have taken our illustrations and examples of Hemingway's style and manner largely from this book, we have done o not merely to achieve a sort of unity but because this book is probably he richest wellspring for those thoughts which make this writer's ntellectual world distinguishable.

It is, as we have said, a magnificent world. This—if we may state he primary assertion at the outset—is reflected there in the ubiquitous resence of death. Thus Robert Jordan, who fights on the side of the Reds in the Spanish Civil War (and in whom one easily perceives the uthor's own self-image), lives through four tension-crammed days vhich are overshadowed from the very beginning by the dark possibility of death. In the same way the approaching end lies, like some melancholy shadow, over Colonel Cantwell in *Across the River and into the Trees* as he awaits that end at the side of his young and vivacious beloved in he late afternoon sun of Venice. In *The Sun Also Rises* there is an narticulately compelling element in the atmosphere of bull-fighters who lo not merely "play" with death and of the almost nameless hero, Brawny Jake Barnes, whose manly fulfillment of life is destroyed even hough he goes on living. With magnificent restraint the life's ac-complishment of the old man on the sea expires; this whole performance becomes a witness to the last annihilating tragedy of his fisherman's life.

The fact that all of these figures dwell *on the edge of existence*—on the other side of which awaits the weird, dismal mystery of existence itself—removes from Hemingway's thoughts and sentence structure every trace of banality. We are dealing here with the "last things" and not merely with contemplations of them. The masculine austerity of Hemingway's style stems from its being a reflection which is none-theless entirely unreflected. In this style, which is like a healthy plant vithout exuberant growth and rank tendencies, all that really draws

to a conclusion is the action. In the colorful world of bull-fighters or in the dramatically packed dénouement of the Civil War narrative, this action perhaps draws so near home as to be self-evident.

But even during Col. Cantwell's last days in Venice this aloofness from emotion and sentiment is present. It is present in every line of this disciplined prose, which is not loquacious but extremely terse. How astonishing, also, is this hallmark of his style in connection with the almost inconspicuous action in the story of the old fisherman, a story which displays the unheard-of audacity of sketching only this one character. Of course, the little boy does shed a bit of light on him, but, outside of the old fisherman, all the other personages in this story are as mere fugitive shadows rustling past. Although it is finally apparent that practically nothing other than a broadly general and discursive monologue could have emerged, this mute, toneless action is still simply *action*. Nothing more. It is almost as though the monotony of happenstance were an art form of highest refinement, for even here we find no mere gossip or superfluous word. The terseness of style illustrates, with a surgeon's precision, the course of the last total tragedy in the fisherman's working life, and this terseness has imprinted itself upon every line.

However trivial may be the bars and cafeterias in the Spanish narrative, and however knightly and reserved may be the events in the Venetian death story, so also are the four days spent among the simple partisan folk of the Spanish mountains when measured against the great struggle and political perspectives of the Civil War. Equally inconsequential, in comparison with events in the great world outside, is the stilling, annihilating tragedy with which the workaday life of the old fisherman comes to an end. Yet the greatness lies precisely in the fact that everything is full of *action*. Here are people living on the rim of human existence with an uncanny intensity which permeates every pore, every line, and every word.

This prose is the instrument of a quite unique intellectual realism. The bare, crystal-clear discipline of this language betrays not the slightest mirage, not the faintest ray of illusion. To be sure, *For Whom the Bell Tolls* is no small Spanish Civil War narrative; yet one misses throughout any false considerations of an ideological superstructure. Fascism is not denounced, nor is the opposition party glorified. The bull-fighters take very seriously the possibility of death, but they never

o so far as to assume a romantic, heroic pose. Not one word is uttered hich could have the effect of a pathetic gesture *à la* romantic hero orship. The old man dares to make the last great battle of his career, ut while he passes night after night in the ocean's solitude beneath ie glittering stars, there is not the least trace of mythical or mystical eflections to becloud this language in its bright, clear terseness. It is ie world which may be observed and displayed in human words: the eal world, the world "out front," the world in which there are no lusions of party programs or religious theories. It is a world of unistakably temporal quality, displaying that kind of close and intimate xternality which is the emblem of complete worldliness.

Here arises the ultimate question concerning Hemingway. We eal here not only with what is poetically beguiling in Hemingway's reative work but also with an element which is exciting both factually nd from a purely human point of view. For since this sphere of comlete worldliness is surely stripped bare of all illusions, since the attempt nowhere made to superimpose any kind of ideology upon this coruptible, fractured, externally temporary, seemingly trivial world, and nce, on the contrary, the "meaning" of all that occurs must be sought i the very temporality of things, a completely unique security results, security which is anything but secure. If (in *For Whom the Bell 'olls*) the bridge over the ravine is to be blown sky-high in four days nd the world is to become more and more destructible and defense ever iore doubtful, one solitary fact remains: that in this fractured world ne lives, loves, eats, sleeps, and carries out immediately pressing duties -hence one merely lives. No place is given to anything supernatural: iere is not the remotest necessity for it. Destiny unfolds, and to fritter neself away in nervousness or a non-objective egotism is to display lack of inner nobility.

## II

Yet it would be an optical illusion to maintain that this atmosphere f utter worldliness knows no background component. Such an element s simply present in a completely different manner than in those literary orms which we customarily find to be very communicative about such iings.

If we are to observe correctly at this point, it will pay us to shift

our glance to Graham Greene for a moment. Graham Greene's works contain much by way of both explicit and implicit background if one will but disregard the already published works in which even his treatment of religious topics is watered down by his inborn propensity toward colportage and if one will focus attention on the greatest and most powerful of his books, *The Power and the Glory*. Here one very distinctly senses the relationship with Hemingway—and the difference. In the life of the brandy-loving priest, who against his will becomes a martyred saint in the Federal Republic of Mexico, there dwells fully as much of the non-pathetic commonplace as in the lives and deeds of Hemingway's heroes. Here purely bitter events unfold which are overshadowed by the peril of destruction, and there are, just as in Hemingway, commonplace and even stupid chance occurrences from which great tragedy evolves. Yet there is a difference which makes itself plainly felt, even considering this similarity. In Graham Greene's great novel there is more than just an indication of the background element. The figure of the tippling priest is saturated through and through with an underlying—or, better yet, a higher—reality. As he finally falls, fully conscious, into the betrayer's trap, there remains no doubt that here the priestly existence which he himself, through weakness and sin, has already forfeited is for the first time truly fulfilled. The more recent literature affords few such direct demonstrations of that grace which justifies the sinner as in Graham Greene's narrative. Only a convert could have written it. For Greene took his entire Protestant heritage along with him when he entered the Roman Catholic Church, a heritage evidenced by his knowledge of the incomprehensibility of that grace which certifies its majesty precisely through the way in which it holds the profligate, the apostate, and the sinner fast and pronounces them justified.

Hemingway does not deal with things this directly. On this very account we need to make our observations with double caution. It turns out that this author of foreground finity, this artist of terse and nonmetaphysical diction, has nonetheless a very distinct and exact understanding of that mystery which begins on the other side of the boundaries of our earthly life and yet continuously surrounds our common existence.

To be sure, one must not read anything into the text. Undeniably, there are long stretches in Hemingway's work which betray nothing of

race whatsoever. Despite the cool, silvery frosting which coats Col. Cantwell's last days in Venice, his death is devoid of grace because it s devoid of meaning. From the almost wooden diction in which this ast stretch of the road is clothed, it develops that the colonel simply as not mastered this death which is yet so near and so certain. The ntensity of the joy of life with which life's last days are illuminated nly makes everything that much more melancholy and bitter.

In *The Sun Also Rises* much is said about dying and the proximity f death. Yet the atmosphere itself already has become virtually an tmosphere of destruction, and the fate of Barnes, who confronts these nany possibilities of partial or total death almost as if he had no share n them, is permeated with a paralyzing sadness.

No, in these and similar situations one notices nothing of grace. What holds the people together is the commentary—an attitude, a *abitus* which a man cannot surrender in the face of death. But other reat testimonies of literature show how basically empty this mien is. t is only a preliminary stage of nihilism, if not actually one of its irect forms of expression. And it is hardly to the point to realize that n all this precise accuracy of description the exactness of natural-cientific thinking since the nineteenth century has borne fruit. Here s nothing but the cosmos whose center is—Nothing. For this cosmos nan has sought explanations from things near at hand. One of Heming-vay's American critics, Lionel Trilling, has ascertained that "an in-dequate intellectual vitality" appears in contrast to Hemingway's re-narkable faculty of perception of sensuously and emotionally perceptible acts. And here the critics in their eloquence have aimed their fire specially, and with a certain justification, against the Venetian arrative.

Are these critics right? It seems certain that even they have not een exact observers. Hemingway's terse, precise concentration on the angible and demonstrable is, for all we have said, no expression of a elf-contained finality. The terse and non-pathetic diction should rather nake clear, without importing emotionally charged, sentimental, and hereby incredulous reflections, that the reality which is thus so exactly escribed *cannot contain its meaning within itself alone*. Its very unful-lled nature shows that it is open to something which lies on the other ide of its world.

This immediately becomes clear in two strands characteristic of

Hemingway's work, even though it may become clear only momentarily. In Hemingway one finds a lot of loving, and still more drinking. These two massive forms of an inner-worldly fulfillment of meaning are the very forms that make it unambiguously clear, at least in Hemingway's later writings, that they do not contain their meaning in themselves alone. The love scene between Paul Jordan and Maria in *For Whom the Bell Tolls* is ennobled in its questionable nature by the fact that one of them encounters the "thou" in the other and is thereby liberated from the shackles of a meaningless, egotism-fraught way of thinking. The incredible consumption of alcohol in Hemingway's works is, again, a very uncamouflaged testimony to a desperate pressure to overcome the fear of Nothing and an inner emptiness, to wipe out the peril of death, of jealousy, and of the meaninglessness of historical happenstance.

Of course, at best, these are but very transitory realizations. Yet some very genuine realizations underlie them. On the other side of the boundary line of our actual existence, that which is genuinely real and decisive draws to its fulfillment. It is nothing less than the question of guilt, fate, and death which occupies center stage at this point.

Yes, indeed, the question of *guilt*. It is astonishing that something of this sort should emerge in Hemingway's seemingly non-metaphysical work, but that moment is just as unforgettable which is described in Hemingway's greatest book:

"But if I live later, I will try to live in such a way, doing no harm to any one, that it will be forgiven."

"By whom?"

"Who knows? Since we do not have God here any more, neither His Son nor the Holy Ghost, who forgives? I do not know."

"You have not God any more?"

"No. Man. Certainly not. If there were God, never would He have permitted what I have seen with my eyes. Let *them* have God."

"They claim Him."

"Clearly I miss Him, having been brought up in religion. But now a man must be responsible to himself."

"Then it is thyself who will forgive thee for killing."

"I believe so," Anselmo said. "Since you put it clearly in that way I believe that must be it. But with or without God, I think it is a sin to kill. To take the life of another is to me very grave. I will do it whenever necessary but I am not of the race of Pablo."

"To win a war we must kill our enemies. That has always been true."

"Clearly. In war we must kill. But I have very rare ideas," Anselmo said. (*For Whom the Bell Tolls,* p. 41.)

(But later, in a monologue:) "I think that after the war there will have to be some great penance done for the killing. If we no longer have religion after the war, then I think there must be some form of civil penance organized that all may be cleansed from the killing or else we will never have a true and human basis for living. The killing is necessary, I know, but still the doing of it is very bad for a man and I think that, after all this is over and we have won the war, there must be a penance of some kind for the cleansing of us all."

Anselmo was a very good man and whenever he was alone for long, and he was alone most of the time, this problem of the killing returned to him. (*Ibid.,* p. 196.)

Of course, this is not Hemingway himself speaking, nor even the "hero" of his book. It is only Anselmo whom he allows to speak in this fashion and who has not quite come to terms with the question of what is to take the place of the former regulations of the church. Yet this contribution of Anselmo's is not to be viewed apart from the central thrust of the entire narrative. The question comes up again and again; and still, in the apparently pointless end of the entire expedition, in Jordan's peculiar and almost meaningless sacrificial death for the little partisan band, there emerges a concealed consciousness that, considering the man's guilt, something had to happen, that eventually it had to come to confession and penance. That is not saying much, but it is too much to pass by unseen and unheard.

The question of one's *fate,* nowhere really directly stated, is still very close to one's perception. This is already indicated in an entirely peripheral remark from *The Sun Also Rises:* "Listen, Robert, going to another country doesn't make any difference. I've tried all that. You can't get away from yourself by moving from one place to another. I've tried all that" (p. 11). One must know this and keep it in mind in order to understand the way in which Hemingway constantly broods over the issue of fate and wrestles with it even in places where he appears to say not one word about it. This fact comes to its greatest expression in his recent book. The way in which the old man slowly sails for home with the giant fish, the most magnificent catch of his life, and continues with the day-by-day performance of the sailor and fisherman even as the sharks snatch his prize away from him piece by piece, or the way he finally arrives home and sinks into a dreamless,

unworried sleep, thereby quietly acquiescing in this grand and silent tragedy at the grave of his vocational success—all this is like a variation on the great theme of *amor fati,* of one's affirmation of fate. Even this belief in fate remains, like all belief in *fatum,* anonymous. Fate has no name. Yet it is a question which reaches out over the banal, day-to-day existence of the fisherman, an existence portrayed with photographic accuracy and a naturalist's exactitude. This tragedy sheds light on the whole of his existence.

What lies on the other side of our recognizable existence comes most clearly to our attention in Hemingway's thoughts concerning *death.* Of all the figures he portrays (almost all of whom live in the shadow of imminent death), the best example is the bull-fighter. It is he who stands over against the most difficult human task, "facing death." More distinctly than all of Hemingway's other figures who shoulder the same task, he is marked by his absolute nearness to death. In fact, to use Hemingway's own words, one cannot live daily with the possibility of meeting death without wearing a very plain mark announcing that fact.

The greatest aspect of these episodes which tower over the edge of human existence is that for Hemingway they are *genuine and open questions.* What Hemingway offers by way of attempting an answer, and a direct answer at that, is not overwhelming. One finds here, in a style reminiscent of Spengler's, a touch of noble resignation to one's fate; and what Hemingway has to say about overcoming one's destiny to die is undeniably ambiguous and incomplete. It is, however, significant that these questions are raised and that Hemingway, in that clear diction which is his own, does not hush them up. For thereby it is made clear that this finitude of Hemingway's intellectual realm is no rigid, hardened reality nailed down fast despite all metaphysics, but just the opposite. The more terse and unpretentious the language, and the more distinct the renunciation of all ideology and interpretation, the clearer it becomes that the answer to such questions cannot be sought within human ken.

## III

No interpretative art will succeed in claiming Hemingway for Christian thought. Anyone who has read his writings knows this. Yet

: will profit nothing—and this is no less significant—to turn him into a erald of an essentially innerworldly, non-metaphysical viewpoint. The uestion is posed too clearly and its weight cannot be overshadowed, ven if it does not carry its own answer within itself. Nonetheless, it s possible to trace lines of communication from Hemingway's descrip- ion, and from his total intellectual realm, on into the light-range of ivine grace.

At the outset one absolutely astonishing point should be mentioned. All of Hemingway's characters confront an existence reduced to the ero point. In the last few years much has been said about "grace at ero point." That is hardly a literal equivalent of the significance of xistence in Hemingway, but the two are similar—one might say arallel—to each other. The Christian understands not only the his- orical situation of Germany following 1945 in the context of this grace at zero point," but the possibility of a radically new beginning s well. He must think in this manner because only by so doing can he nderstand human existence. What the great Frenchman, Fénelon, aid about God's being able to build his structure only on the ruins of ur ego contains a commonly held Christian truth. God is able to take his humanity, which has fallen to sin and death and which on that ccount is subject to his divine judgment, and raise it up.

We still must attempt a clear description of the similarity, and the lifference, between Hemingway's understanding of existence and the nessage of the New Testament. We still must speak of Hemingway's osition concerning death. He himself asserts that he took his most famous book title from a quotation by John Donne:

No man is an *Iland,* intire of it selfe; every man is a peece of the *Continent,* a part of the *maine:* if a *Clod* bee washed away by the *Sea, Europe* is the lesse, as well as if a *Promontorie* were, as well as if a *Mannor* of thy *friends* or of *thine owne* were; any mans *death* diminishes *me,* because I am involved in *Mankinde:* And therefore never send to know for whom the *bell* tolls; It tolls for *thee.*

The distinction here is clear. For John Donne (1573-1631), one of the most beloved sixteenth century Christian poets of England and at the same time a strong and powerful thinker of the Christian faith, leath is the negation of humanity. In precisely this fashion it may be nan's instructor since it reveals his boundaries to him. For Hemingway

death is the final expression of the Self, the fulfillment of human possibilities. It is, so to speak, the humanistic variant of the ancient Christian concept of death; but this variant at once becomes the sentimentalization of this concept—and its falsification. And at this point Hemingway ceases to be realistic.

But there remains the magnificent renunciation of all illusions. What sometimes appears in Hemingway as a purposeless, even senseless, "going under" arises from the proposition that all "ideological" superstructures are rejected and renounced. All froward significations are cast aside. Even though Hemingway does not understand and interpret our mortal destiny in the Christian sense—this negation of humanity being understood and endured only where belief is present in Christ's resurrection from the dead and therefore in resurrection generally—our author nevertheless has depicted as have few others the *desperatio,* the despairing doubt, which always takes possession of man at the moment he bids his illusions farewell. It is quite correct, as some of Hemingway's most perceptive critics have written of him, that these constant attempts to flee into a massive eroticism or an even more massive appetite for alcohol are only outcroppings of a *spiritual condition which demands certainty* but which cannot find, in its environment, the basis for genuine faith. And yet Hemingway's covert longing is clearly discernible.

There is always an attempt to find an answer to the thought of death. Even when there seems to be nothing left in the face of despair save a manly but baseless mien of courage that cannot add up, the orientation of this question still is clear. And it can only increase confidence in Hemingway's ultimate honesty to see clearly how, in setting aside the false, chimerical bridges to the other world, he is about to land on genuine clarity and the right answer.

Again, this is a primary feature which opens Hemingway up to Christian thinking: the *desire for clarity.* Precisely because of this factor, however, the decisive difference cannot be overlooked. Hemingway's thinking proceeds from the proposition that man can exist by and of himself alone. That is exactly what man cannot do. Of that the New Testament leaves no doubt.

What St. Paul says about humanity in Romans 7 is, of course, extraordinarily different from Hemingway in terms of vocabulary and certain contemporary suppositions and thought patterns. It is in the

efinitive diagnosis of humanity, however, that we can scarcely dis-nguish what Paul says from what Hemingway portrays as human ature. Man's mortal and fallen nature, and the fact that he lives in finite world in which he can derive no meaning by and of himself, as all declared by Paul in other words than Hemingway's but no less istinctly. The great difference consists solely in this fact: that Paul oes not interpret man by and of himself but views him *under the resence of God.*

Because human existence is given by God it must, on that account, e responsible before God. The books of the New Testament have some-ning to say about guilt which differs quite emphatically from what Iemingway says. Not only are we concerned with the question which errifies Anselmo—i.e., what sort of atonement man can make for aving killed others—but we think also of the far more encompassing nd frankly deeper question as to whether man, generally speaking, can o anything after having forfeited his total existence before God. One ay hardly quarrel with Hemingway over the true and actual condition f the world. He has seen its calamity too clearly: he knows too exactly hat sort of fractured creature man is, even in his so-called "moral" xistence. Surely we can pick no quarrel here. Or, if there be a difference f opinion (and there is), it consists in this, that all questions con-erning themselves with man refer back to God. It is astonishing that n Hemingway's total creative work man remains basically *alone.* He oes not succeed at community. In the strongest of his books, *For Whom the Bell Tolls,* Hemingway comes closest to genuine interper-onal community. Yet the colonel with his beloved in Venice is quite lone—completely, desolately alone—and the existence of the old man who has caught and then lost the great fish is only very fleetingly il-uminated by that sympathetic boy who brushes through the picture ike some shadow. Otherwise Hemingway's figures are alone, com-pletely alone. In *The Sun Also Rises,* man's final, ultimate solitude finds expression in a genuinely tormenting manner.

In the Bible, however, man is not alone. He is not alone because, above all else, he stands under a grand, objective connection with God. What generally is said about him is but one segment of a great divine plan of salvation. Among the "Reds" in Hemingway's Spanish narra-ive, this plan of salvation is supplanted by an astonishingly rigid and primitive ideal of some future state, a new and numbly perceived order

of fellowship or community for the realization of which one wages war; but no one has more than the vaguest conceptions of it, and nothing very definite or concise is ever said about its state of affairs. Quite emphatically, the New Testament says something else, for here emerges the figure of the *Christian* fellowship. Where this fellowship is really present in the world one will also find, at the same time, peace. Here is a cell of peace, an organism which graphically transforms the world's climate and leads men to men. And all this is possible only because God has spoken his affirmative Word in a distinct and recognizable way to this world that is assuredly his.

The evangelists would not have taken the pains they did to preserve the reports of Jesus' life and death had they not attributed to these events a decisive significance One could openly say, in fact, that here is a very distant yet still striking parallel to Hemingway's narrative style. The fact of the life, death, and resurrection of Jesus Christ is reported with the greatest objectivity in order to make clear that here the *decisive event of world history* has completed its course. One must try to imagine what such trains of thought must have meant for St. Paul. He had a rather comprehensive, even practical, acquaintance with the intellectual world of an antiquity which, in basic outline, betrays a startling similarity to our present-day situation. But from the biblical viewpoint, Paul was conditioned to think of this world as God's possession. God created it and through his hidden plan of salvation so provided for it that it did not completely disintegrate or fall into chaos but rather was in Christ, as Paul expressed it, composed anew. Of course there are "powers" in the world which challenge God's right of ownership and wage warfare against him. But Christ, victor that he is, has hitched these powers to his chariot and has led them along in his triumphal procession. He has robbed death of its power. He has torn out by the roots the domination of sin, sickness, and frustration. The sign of this new world order (or, more accurately expressed, the reestablished world order) is Christ's community, the church. Even though there is no possibility of describing, in precise, earthly terms, that divine majesty which towers over the boundaries of our existence and invades our lives, and which is directly the groundwork and the motive power of our common existence, there still exists the possibility of pointing out certain *signs* by which the ingress of divine grace into our mortally ridden, human, earthbound existence lets itself be re-

ealed. For the astonishing thing is that this reality of God, which omes upon us from beyond our human existence, straightway testifies penly to the manner in which God permits humanity to affirm its nitude. God allows man to affirm the present, the concrete situation gainst which man is posed, and the concrete time into which man s born.

And yet the first essential result of this realization is that the way f escape—no, *all human avenues of escape*—are cut off. One certainly annot deny that practically all the characters of Hemingway's narra-ives are men in flight. The very rejection of all metaphysical accessories n Hemingway makes it evident that it is exactly this affirmation of nitude which does not succeed. Man *cannot* stand at the place where God has placed him if he is to stand there solely under his own power. He *cannot* affirm the moment in which God has placed him; for, on the asis of purely human and intrinsic presuppositions, the moment in vhich he must live and fight and die and wrestle is a moment of mean-nglessness.

The fact that man cannot make this affirmation of finitude on his own merits is what makes decisive the objective divine order which tands above him. What remains for mankind in this world is his divine *Heimatrecht,* his right of homeland, his heritage.

From a practical standpoint our third consideration is really the nost important. It is the first bid of a possibility sought, fervently and above all else, in the present situation: the possibility of a *nova vita,* renewal of life. Jake Barnes, the hero of *The Sun Also Rises,* is dmittedly wounded in a manner that is basically atrocious and is robbed f his life's treasure, yet his entire array of companions lives con-emporaneously with him in an awesomely rotten world. Even as, drunk vith alcohol, they pass their evenings confessing their misery in noc-urnal colloquies, there shines from afar over this world which has een robbed of all stable order the consuming desire for another life hat is fulfilled, regulated, and whole. Bravery even in defeat, disciplined orm, manly courtesy—all this is still not enough, for moralistic court lasters no longer avail. The great opportunity of a world whose inter-reter Ernest Hemingway has become could be that which divine grace ssures (Rev. 21:5): "Behold, I make all things new."

# Lutheran Separation—the Ohio Story

By Willard D. Allbeck

IN THE long configuration of Christianity the tensions evoked by variety have tested and sometimes ruptured the fabric of fellowship. Lutheranism in America has experienced the same impulse to fission. Upstart minor foci have erupted in insurrection to dethrone the central focus of fellowship and to replace an inclusive organism with segregated fractional ones. The complexity of synodical organizations, now in the process of reduction by mergers, is a phenomenon puzzling to Europeans and non-Lutherans alike. A review of the events productive of this complexity is not without value in understanding the problem of Lutheran unity in America.

Ohio is an excellent area for studying the events for several reasons. In the early years of its settlement Ohio's population was more truly representative of all the nation than any other state. Settlers from virtually the whole Atlantic seaboard converged on Ohio. People from New England came to the Western Reserve, and pioneers from the South occupied the Virginia Military Lands. Families from North Carolina established homes near those of Pennsylvanians, and people from Maryland were neighbors to immigrants from Europe. Here was ample complexity of heritage and tradition.

Important and populous as Ohio became, it was also located between two mighty areas of influence pulling in opposite directions: the more populous East and the great, vigorous West. Ohio had neither a New York nor a Chicago. In whatever other areas of life this fact had significance it was especially important for Lutheranism in the state. Despite real strength in Ohio, there was to be felt the powerful pull of influences from both East and West. In Ohio, therefore, as in no other state was to be seen the rise of events crystalizing the threefold trends which in the course of the years are consolidating into three main groups of Lutherans in America.

Ohio was a battleground where the issues were clarified by schism somewhat earlier than elsewhere. Here the tensions quickly became acute to the point of rupture. The schism of the Tennessee Synod from

at of North Carolina terminated with that one body; but in Ohio e fracture was multiple. Party lines appearing here anticipated those be drawn elsewhere.

The tensions were only partly geographical, though that aspect ıst not be neglected. The position on the map between strong areas influence is not unrelated to the independent, intermediate position tween extremes—a position assumed by a large part of Ohio Lueranism to be characteristic of itself. But matters of doctrine and actice, of confessional loyalty and fraternizing with non-Lutherans, institutional loyalties and policies, of linguistic preference or of naonal Lutheran union appeared in varying degrees and combinations. yndromes of these matters always appeared in the tensions.

Before reviewing the story in some detail it will be well to sketch ıe main outlines.

After preliminary conferences there came into existence in 1818 .e Evangelical Lutheran Synod of Ohio and Neighboring States, a edominantly German-speaking body. It was the hope of this synod include all Lutheran congregations in Ohio, western Pennsylvania, estern Virginia, northern Kentucky, eastern Indiana, and southern Iichigan. In such a large territory, with poor facilities for travel, the rst tension was geographical. As a solution the synod subdivided in 831 into an Eastern and a Western District, each with virtually ynodical powers. The districts held conventions for two consecutive ears and met in joint session every third year. Hence the larger body as known as the Joint Synod of Ohio. The subdivision was peaceful, nd for administrative purposes only, without any rejection of fellowhip.

The second tension was linguistic, resulting in the erection of a on-geographical English District in 1836. Other factors amplified ıe tension so that the majority of the pastors of this English District rried it into separation and independence four years later. Subseuently, by peaceful geographic allocation there was organized the Iiami Synod in southwestern Ohio and the Wittenberg Synod in the orthwestern part of the state, while the English Synod (later reamed "East Ohio Synod") continued in northeastern Ohio. All three ere English-speaking bodies.

A third tension was confessional. Within the Joint Synod were astors who favored the inter-confessional position of the union

churches in Germany, and there were others who strongly preferred firm adherence in doctrine and practice to what was called confessional Lutheranism. The first party separated to constitute the Tuscarawas Synod; the second party withdrew and entered into correspondence with other pastors farther west, resulting in the formation of the German Evangelical Lutheran Synod of Missouri, Ohio, and other States.

Meanwhile, on the border areas where the tensions were a combination of geography, language, confession, and other matters, there arose independent synods, not schismatic from the Joint Synod but with little fellowship with it, and often in direct rivalry. In Kentucky and beyond was the Synod of the West. In Indiana were two Indiana Synods, an Indianapolis Synod, an Olive Branch Synod, and a Northern Indiana Synod. In western Pennsylvania was the Pittsburgh Synod. Michigan saw efforts at synodical organization.

Interwoven with these tensions were others which concerned such matters as affiliation with the General Synod, the use of revivalistic methods, the support of certain church papers, and loyalty to any of the theological seminaries then in existence. Any one of these could produce heated debate. Combinations of them evoked irreconcilable antagonisms and determined decisions to schism.

Let us identify the synods concerned, for some inaccurate information has been published concerning some of them.

First and central in the scene was the Joint Synod of Ohio. This was the synod of the pioneers who came over the mountains and through the river valleys into the state. The first pastors had received their licenses or ordination from the Ministerium of Pennsylvania, holding for the most part the views of that body. When there were enough pastors west of the mountains to organize, they held their first Special Conference at the time of full moon in mid-October, 1812, functioning as a part of the parent synod. Within six years this body determined upon independence, and for this purpose the pastors and lay delegates gathered on Saturday, September 14, 1818, at Somerset, Ohio. A bronze tablet on a large boulder now marks the site of the convention.

Since union was more important for this small body than variations which had not yet become controversial, the synod had an inclusive character. The whole Ohio River valley with its tributaries was the geographic extent, involving several states. The synod was predominantly, but not exclusively, German. The program of the conventions

normally included at least one sermon in English. In 1825 the synod ordered twelve hundred copies of its minutes to be printed in German and five hundred in English. There was inclusiveness of viewpoint in religion also. John Stough (Johannes Stauch) was a pietist whose importance is indicated by the fact that he was the first president. Paul Henkel and his sons affirmed a more explicit Lutheranism as a basis for rejecting the General Synod. John Michael Steck, occupying a position between Stough and Henkel, opposed the General Synod on the practical grounds typical of a vigorous frontier spirit of independence. Despite such differences, all three pastors were active in the synod.

Through the years this tolerant inclusiveness continued. In geography, the area was actually extended. In language, provision was made for increasing use of English. The synod published a liturgy in English twelve years before it issued one in German. In one instance a congregation of immigrant Alsatians conducted the dedication of their church in French. In matters of viewpoint, though the majority opinion was increasingly conservative, there is no record of any pastor being excluded for his views. Those in the minority, if they withdrew, did so because they thought that the differences in viewpoint were intolerable.

Despite such inclusiveness, the Joint Synod had certain characteristics accepted by a large majority of its pastors and adhered to with firmness sufficient to irritate those in the minority. The synod, being opposed to territorial subdivision marked by complete independence, steadily favored policies which combined unity with expansion until ultimately it became a nationwide body. In the matter of language it must be said that for much of the nineteenth century English was tolerated rather than espoused. German was to be preferred and cultivated. In matters of theology the position of typical Lutheran doctrine became increasingly firm. Pastors not in sympathy with this trend found it convenient to transfer their membership to other bodies.

The English (later East Ohio) Synod began as a district authorized by the Joint Synod in 1836. The first business session was held on Monday, November 7, of that year. An article in the constitution bound the district to the Joint Synod. An editorial in the January 20, 1837, issue of *The Lutheran Observer* called this article "fetters around themselves and their successors" and called on the pastors of the district to "maintain their liberty." Such sentiment came to be held by the majority of the district which in 1840 revised its constitution so

as to become an independent synod. These pastors resented their position as a small English minority in the Joint Synod. In addition they objected to being bound by resolutions condemning revivals and by articles pledging adherence to the Augsburg Confession. Moreover, they desired to affiliate with the General Synod.[1]

The attitudes of these pastors cannot be attributed entirely to their being trained in the East. At the time of the separation there were twenty-two pastors involved, five of them refusing to go with the majority and continuing as an English District. Biographical data are lacking in some cases, but it seems that fifteen of the twenty-two had received their theological training in Ohio. Four others had come from Gettysburg Seminary, and three had studied under eastern pastors. Thus the attitudes were in part at least indigenous.

Separation came about because the English minority in the Joint Synod was unwilling to accept or adjust to the positions of the majority. The pastors of the minority did not want their views tolerated and quietly despised; they wanted them affirmed—something impossible in the larger body. The differences had led to distrust and, with the separation, to recriminations, as may be seen in the published minutes and in the columns of *The Lutheran Observer*.

The organizing convention of the Miami Synod was held at Xenia, Ohio, October 16 and 17, 1844. Plans for this body in the southwestern part of the state had been made by the English Synod, five of whose clergy joined with five from other synods in the organization. The Miami Synod, arising thus by peaceful arrangement, had a less vehement antagonism to the Joint Synod than did the English Synod. It was also more moderate in its attitudes toward other issues. But union with the Joint Synod was clearly impossible because it was convinced that in the future English must be the language used in Lutheran congregations.

In 1847 the English Synod decided on a further territorial division. During the convention of that year, in accordance with a resolution then adopted, the pastors in the northwestern part of the state assembled on June 8 and organized under the name Wittenberg Synod. Its temper and outlook were identical with those of the English Synod. It was organized purely for local and administrative reasons. It con-

1 *Minutes* of the English Synod, 1841, p. 8. *The Lutheran Observer,* VIII, 35 (April 30, 1841).

curred in the view that it was best to have small, autonomous, completely independent synods which might federate in any desired larger organization with no surrender of synodical powers. It was in favor of "synod's rights."

The short-lived Tuscarawas Synod was another instance of the disposition to form small, independent synods—in this case German. It was organized July 2, 1848, at Massillon, Ohio, by members of the Michigan Synod living in northern Ohio—with the consent of the parent body.[2] Two years later a new constitution was adopted and signed by ten pastors, changing the name of the body to *Deutscher Evangelischer Kirchenverein in Ohio*. Later it became part of *Der Deutsche Evangelische Kirchenverein des Westens*.[3] By this change the synod ceased to be officially Lutheran and became union.

The brief existence of the Tuscarawas Synod (named, likely, for the river valley in its area) pointed to a problem. A considerable number of Lutheran congregations in Ohio were joined to those of the German Reformed Church in the ownership of church buildings. The Tuscarawas Synod represented the threat that such dual congregations might actually combine to form a unity which was neither Lutheran nor Reformed but simply Union.

Some of the pastors in Ohio had been sent to America by union missionary societies such as that of Basel, Barmen, and Hanau. The Tuscarawas Synod pastors were men of this sort. And when it became the *Kirchenverein* with a clear union policy, certain pastors in the Joint Synod were attracted to it. In several instances men of the Tuscarawas Synod chose the Joint Synod over the *Kirchenverein*. In any case Lutherans in Ohio were confronted with the union problem, for by no means all the pastors who came from Germany were "old Lutheran." The members of the Joint Synod or of other synods who joined the *Kirchenverein* did so because they were dissatisfied with the Lutheran "confessional" position for various reasons. They wanted a union policy for Lutherans in America comparable to that in Germany.

The Synod of the West, comprising pastors in southern Indiana,

2 *The Lutheran Standard,* VI, 62 (August 2, 1848). Evidently this synod was too small to publish its minutes; none are known to exist.

3 *Op. cit.,* VIII, 20 (November 6, 1850). Carl E. Schneider, *The German Church on the American Frontier* (St. Louis, 1939), pp. 391 f. The *Minutes of the English Evangelical Lutheran (District) Synod and Ministerium of Ohio and Adjacent States*, 1850, pp. 11f., give the fullest summary of the reorganizing convention.

Kentucky, and Tennessee, signaled the fact that the Joint Synod with its claim to "neighboring states" could not be so extended. The first effort to organize the synod failed. Only three clerical and three lay delegates responded to the summons to meet at Jeffersontown, Kentucky, October 11, 1834, so action was postponed for a year.[4] It was in Louisville, Kentucky, that formal organization occurred on Monday, October 5, 1835.

The Synod of the West was conciliatory in spirit. It was bilingual, but with a preference for English. It tried to avoid conflict with the Joint Synod, but one or two efforts at fellowship were unsuccessful. In spirit and character the Synod of the West closely resembled the English Synod, with which body it negotiated about cooperation in joint educational and publishing enterprises. The negotiations failed because it was spread thin over a large area. In June, 1846, it subdivided into three synods, the Synod of the West occupying the state of Indiana for six struggling years until it disbanded.

The divisive spirit common in the 1840's and '50's made impossible a union of the Lutherans in the area of the Western District of the Joint Synod within Indiana. The Evangelical Lutheran Synod of Indiana, organized August 15, 1835, consisted of pastors from the Tennessee Synod who had fellowship with that body rather than with Ohio. Vehement antagonism to the General Synod made union with the Synod of the West impossible. Doctrinal dissension in 1848 split the body into two synods, each with the same name. The smaller group exhausted itself in litigation and disbanded after three years. The larger group continued until 1859, when it reorganized under the name "Union Synod of the Evangelic Lutheran Church."

Meanwhile the Indianapolis Synod came into existence for six years. It was organized September 3, 1846, at Indianapolis by four pastors who had withdrawn from the Synod of the West because of their preference for German and for the Lutheran Confessions. Without sufficient strength to survive, it fell apart, its members joining either the Joint Synod of Ohio or the Missouri Synod.

The formation of two English synods in Indiana was by peaceful territorial adjustment made by parent bodies in Ohio. Pastors of the Miami Synod organized the Olive Branch Synod in Indianapolis Oc-

4 *Minutes of the General Synod,* 1835, p. 7. *Lutheran Observer,* November 14, 1834, p. 47. Several encyclopedias are mistaken on this point.

tober 28-30, 1848, for work in southern Indiana. In the northern part of the state the Synod of Northern Indiana was formed at Columbia City October 25-27, 1855, by pastors of the Wittenberg and Olive Branch synods. These two new bodies simply perpetuated the policy of the English synods in Ohio, favoring small autonomous bodies occupying limited geographical areas, though federated in the General Synod. They thus also perpetuated the separation from the Joint Synod of Ohio, so that union in Indiana was impossible.

In western Pennsylvania, which was part of the Eastern District of the Joint Synod of Ohio, there was organized the Pittsburgh Synod January 15, 1845. The charter members came from five synods whose activity overlapped in the area. The organizers made the claim that western Pennsylvania had been merely the marginal area of other synods and therefore was neglected; independence was necessary to correct this condition. The synod attempted to follow a policy of inclusiveness and moderation in matters of language and parish practice, though in doctrine it was more conservative than the English synods in Ohio. Efforts at maintaining friendly relations with the Joint Synod were frustrated by irritations arising out of rivalry in local parishes and mutual accusations of intrusion. The separation was largely geographical and organizational, though in the course of time the Pittsburgh Synod represented "English Lutherans" and the Joint Synod the "German Lutherans."

The German Evangelical Lutheran Synod of Missouri, Ohio, and other States, organized at Chicago in a convention beginning April 26, 1847, included at its formation Ohio pastors and congregations who either never belonged to the Joint Synod or who withdrew from it. The focus of dissatisfaction with the Joint Synod was language, but around it clustered doctrinal and practical matters. The pastors who were coming to Ohio from Germany represented all shades of theological opinion, from the unionists in the Tuscarawas Synod on the left to the strict confessionalists on the right who entered the Missouri Synod. Both were minorities, quite small numerically.

Those on the extreme right made an issue of two matters, suffering defeat in both instances. The first was confessional. There was a demand that the Joint Synod answer the question, "What synods are Lutheran?" and include in the answer a condemnation of the General Synod—a polemical action the Joint Synod was reluctant to take. There

was a demand that the formula of administration in the Lord's Supper be amended by omitting the word "Jesus said." Though the English liturgy issued by the Joint Synod in 1830 used the words, "Take and eat, this is the Body of Christ . . . ," the German liturgy adopted in 1842, in cooperation with the Ministerium of Pennsylvania and the New York Synod, read, "Jesus said, take and eat, this is my body. . . ." The Joint Synod rejected this demand by a decisive vote. A demand that ordinands be required to pledge themselves to all the Lutheran Confessions was passed by with no action. That the Joint Synod regarded these as demands of extremists is indicated by the fact that it had no sympathy for the General Synod, and when the liturgy of the three synods was revised a very few years later the Joint Synod insisted on the Lutheran rather than the Union formula for distribution on the grounds that most of its pastors were using it.[5]

The other issue was that of the language to be used in the theological instruction of the Seminary at Columbus. The first professor, Wilhelm Schmidt, apparently used English occasionally. Soon after his death there was a German and an English professor. But they and their partisans disagreed violently. Since the very existence of the seminary was threatened, the Joint Synod met in extra session, deciding excitedly by a vote of thirty-eight to ten that only German was to be used in theological instruction. This was a sharp reversal of the inclusive policy in force hitherto.

Instead of settling the matter, this decision increased the controversy. Editor Emanuel Greenwald criticized the action in the columns of *The Lutheran Standard*. Congregations began to withhold contributions for seminary support, and the enrollment dropped. At the regular convention the next year, the synod reversed itself by a vote of forty-two to twenty-four and so placed administration in charge of the Board of Directions as to make the decision irreversible. For those who wanted the seminary to be exclusively German this was utter and final defeat. But the synod had come to its senses.

Four months after the convention a meeting was held at Cleveland for the purpose of considering what action to take, perhaps to form a new synod. Most of the pastors and teachers present had been sent to America by Wilhelm Loehe. All were committed to a strict con-

5 *Minutes of the Joint Synod*, 1853, pp. 9, 18, 23ff.

fessionalism. Some of them had no connection with any synod in America, a few others belonged to the Michigan Synod, and eight were members of the Joint Synod of Ohio. A document signed September 18, 1845, by these men of the Joint Synod renounced all connection with that body. The reasons for the secession were listed under the two categories already noted. It was asserted that the basic German nature of the seminary was being compromised for the sake of finances. "This is the main cause of our secession."[6] After two years of negotiations with pastors farther west, the synod was organized.

The loss to the Joint Synod in the number of pastors seceding was small, though in the acute shortage of pastors in that day every man was needed. More serious was the fact that the hope of winning into synod membership the independent pastors who held strict doctrinal views and who formed the link with the Loehe missionary impulse in Germany was now at an end. Moreover, there would now be competition with the Missouri Synod for the German element in Ohio, just as the English synods were rivals for the English population. The Joint Synod, which had attempted to solve its problems with both firmness and moderation, had lost its extreme English wing because of its firmness and was losing its extreme German wing because of its moderation.

Twice more in the century the Joint Synod was to lose its English District. In 1855, besides a conflict of personalities, there was sharp disagreement over the synod's policies in administering Capital University. In 1869 the difficulty centered around the right of the English District to joint the General Council. Both of these bodies declared adherence to the Lutheran Confessions. Both expressed resentment over what seemed to them to be the inconsiderate pressure of a dominant German majority. In both instances the idea of the autonomy of small synods was accepted as valid. Separation was preferred to patient pursuit of unity amid diversity of opinion.

It must be apparent that in the 1840's geography was a factor in producing the kind of outlook which could look upon such separations with favor. It was a time when railroads were just beginning to be laid in the state. Many years would elapse before train travel would be easy and convenient. Meanwhile a journey by road or by canal boat was

6 The document in English translation appeared in *The Lutheran Standard*, III, 52 (Feb. 18, 1846), p. 3. The account of the meeting in Walter A. Baepler, *A Century of Grace* (St. Louis, 1947), p. 87, tells only of confessional objections.

tedious and time-consuming. Under such circumstances there were advantages in limiting the size of synods to small areas so that travel to conventions was not burdensome.

Related to convenience was the desire for local control. This in national politics was the preference for state authority as against the "federalist" aim of a strong central government. Part of the objection against the General Synod made by the Joint Synod was precisely this. Pastors in Ohio were in accord with the views of David Henkel, of the Tennessee Synod, who objected to placing the management of the Gettysburg Seminary in the hands of a board of directors, saying, "This looks like Federalists' work, yea, like monarchy itself. A few to govern a whole free, independent community is too much to swallow. But it is evident that Federalists are at the head of the matter."[7]

Though such sentiments brought into being the Ohio Synod in 1818, a subtle change occurred, so that something approaching the "federalist" position was held by the Joint Synod while the "synod's rights" viewpoint was espoused by the other synods. When complete local control was lacking there was sufficient feeling of injustice to induce actual separation. This is an interesting phenomenon in the light of mergers now in progress whereby much local autonomy is being quietly surrendered.

Language was a battle line whenever ardor for German stood opposite "nativism." On the one side was the determination to preserve the great German heritage in literature, hymns, and theology. Such a view was expressed by Edward Hengstenberg, who spent about a year studying the conditions of Germans in the United States.[8] To such persons the change from German to English was something of a betrayal, an evidence of disloyalty. Thus there was opposition to the use of English. Pastor J. G. C. Schweizerbarth, in his dislike of the General Synod Seminary at Gettysburg, spoke of it disdainfully as the "Irish Seminary." A writer in Wooster declared, "Some congregations have been preached to death and others in a measure ruined by this unreasonable opposition to English preaching."[9]

7 An old letter printed in translation in *The Lutheran Observer,* April 15, 1864.

8 His report entitled Germans in North America was published serially beginning March 20, 1847, in the *Evangelische Kirchenzeitung* edited by his brother, Ernest W. It was translated with critical notes by W. M. Reynolds and published serially in *The Lutheran Observer* beginning December 10, 1847 (Vol. XV, No. 15).

9 Letter signed "Tully" in *The Lutheran Observer,* IV, 35 (April 21, 1837), p. 137.

The "nativist" point of view sponsored by the Know Nothing Party showed hostility to anything foreign. Lutherans in Ohio did not entirely escape its influence. Those who favored the use of only English in church united in the "adoption of strictly Lutheran and American principles." They were determined that their church "shall not be fettered by foreign languages, usages, or opinions, but shall sanction those which, while they conform to the Word of God and the spirit of our church, are likewise adapted to the circumstances of our own native country."[10]

This was an issue that aroused strong emotions. Each side found it impossible to have patience with the other party. Epithets caused hard feelings. Separation seemed the only answer. The minority party was irritated when the business of conventions was conducted in a language they understood only imperfectly, if at all. And when the German party tried to obstruct the introduction of English hymns and tunes to the congregations there was exasperation on both sides. So each went its own way.

On matters of doctrine the Joint Synod only gradually came to clear definition. There is no evidence that a majority of the pastors of that synod in 1818 held strong confessional views. Evidently they accepted a "generic Lutheranism" which approved doctrines common to most Protestants but which had no enthusiasm for distinctive doctrines that might be considered sectarian. Presently there arose another party which was eager to affirm a distinctively Lutheran position represented by the Unaltered Augsburg Confession.

The points at issue between the two parties became clear in a debate conducted in the columns of *The Lutheran Observer* between S. S. Schmucker and William M. Reynolds.[11] Schmucker felt that all that was necessary was "absolute assent to the Bible . . . and qualified assent to the Augsburg Confession." The doctrine of the real presence he "always regarded as unscriptural." He talked a great deal about freedom from the bondage of creeds and about the right to make changes. Reynolds would have none of it. He asked, "How can anyone who rejects the Augsburg Confession be a Lutheran?" He approved the Con-

10 *Proceedings of the Second Session of the Evangelical Lutheran Synod of Miami,* 1845, p. 9.

11 The debate was opened by Reynolds with a series of articles entitled, "Memoranda upon the Historical and Doctrinal Basis of the American Lutheran Church," beginning with the issue of Sept. 21, 1849 (Vol. XVII, No. 38). It closed in the issue of May 10, 1850 (Vol. XVIII, No. 19).

fessions, saying, "If, therefore, the American church wish to remain Lutheran it must retain these Confessions." There was a trace of nativism in Schmucker's reply: "We close these articles with the earnest hope that our ministers and laity will vindicate their rights as American Lutherans and will not suffer themselves to be deprived of their Protestant liberties by the influence of old Lutherans who have not yet been amongst us long enough to appreciate either our civil or religious institutions." Said Reynolds, "Such demagogueism is unworthy of a theologian."

This debate between two men at Gettysburg was of interest in Ohio, not only because Reynolds came to be the first president of Capital University but also because readers of the magazine in the state promptly took sides. The English Synod at its 1850 convention officially expressed approval of Schmucker's position. Such a viewpoint was intolerable in the Joint Synod, which as early as 1836 expressed loyalty to the Augsburg Confession and twelve years later was requiring its ordinands to subscribe the whole Book of Concord.

For those who rebelled against confessional subscription separation was the only solution. It drove some German pastors into the Tuscarawas Synod and the *Kirchenverein,* and most English pastors into the independent English synods. Only the Pittsburgh Synod and the second English (District) Synod of Ohio had any considerable success in combining English and independence with confessionalism.

In the area of practice, revivals were the chief issue. Designated "new measures," these practices stressed personal piety, much as Lutheran pietism had done. They seemed to be effective means for combating the irreligion of the new West. The aim was to achieve "experimental religion." Congregations in the English synods were encouraged "to promote genuine revivals by faithful preaching of the word, by prayer, and such other means as accord with the holy religion of the blessed Redeemer."[12] Opposition to "new measures" was looked upon as antagonism to true spirituality and an evidence of cold formalism.

Those opposed to revivals looked upon them as occasions of mere "animal excitement." The emotionalism evident in them was viewed with deep suspicion. This viewpoint was well represented by Frederick Wynecken, who in 1843 published *Die Noth der deutschen Lutheraner*

12 *Minutes* of the English Synod of Ohio, 1841, p. 13.

*in Nord America.* He wrote that in the "protracted meetings" there was great excitement and "the most revolting exhibitions were made." W. M. Reynolds, who translated the passage, denied that this was true of Lutherans.[13]

The "new measure" men, counting their converts and seeing their churches grow, were so certain of the righteousness of their cause that they could tolerate no criticism. In the "old measure" men the accusation of lack of spirituality rankled. They could see only fanaticism in the activity of their opponents. In a sense the use of "new measures" was a kind of betrayal since these were the methods used by the sects that were stealing Lutheran sheep. On this matter no compromise was possible.

Another divisive issue was the question of the General Synod. The "Proposed Plan," issued in 1819, had suggested a federation of synods with some slight delegated powers. In Ohio, where anti-federalist sentiment dominated the political scene, there was prompt opposition to the Plan. There was the fear that "through the adoption of the Proposed Plan we would convey a large part of our rights into the hands of some few persons, namely, the delegates to the General Synod."[14] Though the constitution as finally adopted made the General Synod a "joint committee" of synods to promote unity by conference and agreement, the Joint Synod remained aloof, finding additional reasons for its position. The synods in competition with it usually joined the General Synod. Though abstaining from the violent polemics indulged in by the Tennessee and Indiana Synods, the Joint Synod had a profound distaste for the national body.

In reality the Joint Synod, standing between the General Synod and the Missouri Synod, considered itself holding the middle ground between "pseudo-Lutherans" and "ultra-Lutherans." The one allowed too much liberty in doctrine and practice, the other too little. Both extremes were in a measure blind to history: the one in its zeal for Americanizing was unable to see the values of traditional Lutheranism; the other, comprising men newly come to America, had no appreciation of American traditions. To hold an intermediate position was sometimes impossible. And though through the years both extremes have moved toward the center, there is still enough heritage of the sentiments of the past to perpetuate Lutheran separation in America.

13 *The Lutheran Observer,* XI, 49 (Aug. 9, 1844), p. 1.

14 C. O. Kraushaar, *Verfassungsformen der Lutherischen Kirche Amerikas,* p. 443.

# The Debate Between Eck and Melanchthon on Original Sin at the Colloquy of Worms

By Heinz Mackensen

THE COLLOQUY held at Worms from January 14 to 18, 1541 was one episode in the attempts during the fifth decade of the sixteenth century to reconcile the conflicting religious parties of that age by way of conferences and discussions. Emperor Charles V, motivated chiefly by political considerations, was the chief driving force behind such attempts on the Catholic side. On the Lutheran side the Hessian landgrave and the elector of Brandenburg followed a similar course. There were also theologians on both sides who believed that the doctrinal issues could still be settled in a conciliatory manner. The theological spokesmen chosen by each side to represent it at Worms in 1541 were not, however, of this sort.

The holding of such a colloquy was thus a victory for the forces of concord in both camps. The choice of speakers, however, was a victory for the forces in both camps that supported the basic doctrines of their respective sides with full conviction and with real insight into the irreconcilable contradictions that were involved. John Eck had opposed Luther's views from the very beginning of the Reformation. He was very jealous and proud of his role as the chief defender of the old faith in Germany and loved to appear as the bluff scholastic conservative who was no less German than Luther, even in his sense of humor. Melanchthon was a much more complicated and finer personality. Thoroughly grounded in both scholastic and humanistic learning, he had not lost sight, while working at Luther's side, of the need to seek to maintain the unity of the faith in the bond of peace. Nevertheless, he showed in his presentations at this colloquy a deep and firm commitment to the truth as he saw it in the Word of God and as he had himself expressed it in the Augsburg Confession and its Apology.

After four days of debate the colloquy was postponed until the imperial diet to be held during the coming summer at Ratisbon. Thus the colloquy of Worms itself was merely an episode. The contents of

The debate are, however, not lacking in value for the student of theology. The contemporary theologian can see here how seriously the doctrine of original sin was taken by the theologians of the Reformation period, how anxious they were that the doctrinal formularies which they subscribed should really be accurate expressions of the faith that was in them, and how on the other hand they constantly inquired whether their faith was in harmony with scriptural and/or patristic and ecclesiastical authority. Moreover, the protagonists of the opposing sides can here be seen seeking to sound out the differences that separated them with a minimum of polemical zeal.

The report of the debate has been translated into English for the first time from the original Latin text published in 1837.[1] Unimportant sections of the debate and discussions of biblical and other texts are omitted in the interests of brevity. The more important sections, which show both the basic positions and the contrasting personalities of the two collocutors, are reproduced in translation. Explanatory statements by the writer and summaries of the arguments omitted are printed in italics. Page numbers in brackets indicate the corresponding pages or columns in Bretschneider's Latin edition.

Eck began the colloquy in the morning of Friday, January 14, 1541. *He first emphasized that the version of the Augsburg Confession submitted by the Lutherans at this colloquy differed from the original and that this had caused delays in beginning the colloquy. He insisted that his party thought nothing more important than to restore unity "with those who have gone out from among us." He promised to dispute in a candid and friendly manner. Turning to the Augsburg Confession, which was to serve as the basis for the debate, Eck quickly passed over the Preface and the First Article (on the Trinity) as not being in dispute.*

Eck [p. 35]: In the Second Article, therefore, in which are condemned the old and new Pelagians who deny original sin in infants (just as Zwingli defined original sin as merely a certain defect of human nature), original sin is correctly explained. However, there are two points which we should like to have explained more clearly so that we may arrive at the desired agreement.

The first point has to do with the explanation of original sin in the [Augsburg] Confession as not only including the effects of that sin but also as including those of serious actual sins. On this point the Apology [of the Augsburg Confession] does not present the matter so gently but greatly intensifies it by attributing to those in original sin not only a terrible blindness and disobedience but even a hatred and contempt of God, unfaithfulness, and many other effects. Since, how-

1 Carl Gottlieb Bretschneider, ed., *Corpus Reformatorum, Melanchthonis Opera* (Halle, 1837), V, 33-78.

ever, up to now a distinction has always been made in the church and by the holy fathers between actual and original sin, lest infants be weighed down with such great guilt, it would seem that the ancient explanation of the fathers should suffice. And if this point will be explained properly we shall be able to come to an agreement, for the Apology does not reject the doctrine that original sin consists of the lack of that original righteousness which should be present in man. For this reason I do not doubt that my collocutor and his fellows, if they seek agreement, shall easily be able to come to an opinion agreeable to us.

The second point, which was proposed in a veiled manner in the Confession but which was unveiled in the Apology is more difficult. For it is stated not only that original sin truly damns before Baptism but that the concupiscence left after Baptism is by itself also truly and simply sin, as my lord collocutor has maintained with many words in the Apology and as he has written in his book *On the Soul.* And Luther, who first incited this antagonism to the church, maintains that concupiscence is not only materially but also formally sinful. For this reason Luther has not unrightfully been castigated (to use an expression in the Apology) by the Catholics on this matter, namely, that he teaches that so much of sinfulness remains both formally and materially after Baptism.

*Eck insisted that agreement would not be easy unless the Lutherans presented "a gentler interpretation of original sin" in which they denied the presence of sin or of sinfulness in infants after Baptism. He cited supporting texts for his views from the Scriptures and the fathers.*

*After Eck's opening statement Melanchthon immediately responded. He began with a prayer that God might turn their inclinations to agreement. Thereupon he stated that the sense of the altered passages in the Augsburg Confession was the same as in the original, although "some things have been softened or more clearly explained in the later edition." Melanchthon objected to Eck's statement that the Lutherans had gone out from among the Catholics. He insisted that they had been driven out. "We leave the final judgment to God and to the assembly of the true church." Melanchthon promised that he too would dispute in a friendly manner and that he would give Eck "that recognition which a learned man should receive." He agreed with Eck that there was no dispute about the First Article and stated that the Lutherans accepted the Nicene and Athanasian creeds* [pp. 37, 38].

Melanchthon [p. 39]: We did not think at the time we presented the Confession that there would be a future discussion with our adversaries about this article. The arguments of others who did away with original sin had to be met, for there have always been those who have believed wrongly about original sin. This has been so because human reason, in forming its opinion, cannot grasp the extent of human depravity. For this reason this article, both as regards the sin itself and also as regards the extent of depravity, has been so fully revealed in God's Word.

My lord Doctor Eck has correctly stated that it is easy to agree upon the definitions, for we accept both of the old definitions: the one which says that original sin is the lack of that original righteousness which should be present, and

ıe other in which it is called concupiscence. We do not think that these definitions ffer from or disagree with our belief. For the term "lack" refers to the depravity ſ those gifts of the Spirit which had been given to our first parents conditionally, amely, the light by which they might recognize God or be able to recognize him, ıe alignment of their wills with God's, and the excellence of all their powers. Vhen these gifts had been lost darkness fell on their minds, their wills were turned side from God's, and the tendencies of their will and of their sense apparatus ll into disorder.

This agrees with that definition in which original sin is called concupiscence. Ve thus distinguish between those divinely given gifts and their depravity or isorder which ensued later. There still remain in the will those godlike aspects hich have been added to human nature. There remain the tendencies in the sense pparatus. Nor did the ancients wish specifically to call those divinely added ndencies "concupiscence," but rather their lack, as there is in Cato love and dmiration of virtue although his will is turned aside from God. For these reasons e believe the old definitions and hold that our belief agrees with them. Although e have used words which describe acts [in reference to original sin], yet we istinguish between original sin and actual sin. And although we have described [original sin] negatively, yet we mean also the depravity of those gifts.

Nor should the objection be made that we have exaggerated the extent of ıe evil, for we have only given it its proper limits. We do not judge to be unnportant that darkness of the mind and that turning aside of the will from God rom which the terrible doubts of the Epicureans and Academicians and endless rrors have arisen. In all ages terrible sacrilege has followed from this perversion f the will. Nor did the prophets describe a slight evil since Jeremiah says, "Man's eart is evil and corrupt" [Jer. 17:9].

That original righteousness which is meant, as we surely believe, by the term likeness or image of God" was not a scanty adornment [of human nature], for ecause of it the human mind was God's temple, from which shone forth outtanding knowledge of, strong allegiance to, and perfect love of God. For this eason Paul admonishes that this image or likeness is to be renewed, and that one ight understand what he meant by the term "image" he added "in holiness, ruth," etc.

If these points agree with the definitions, then there is no disagreement, but ſ they should not agree, we are ready to give a fuller explanation. What we emand in judging is candor. There may perhaps be more controversy on some ther point. We also believe the many testimonies cited by my lord Doctor Eck vhich confirm that in Baptism original sin is removed and that the Holy Spirit vho brings in new light and the turning of the will, is given. Nor do we doubt hat the whole church believes thus. But it is the fullness and glory of Baptism hat there should be such an abundance of grace that the evil which is left is also overed and that it should be forgiven those who remain in grace. For Paul said hat grace abounds over sin.

One point now still remains in controversy: Is the evil that is left over in the

baptized worthy of punishment or is it merely an indifferent thing? Is it something that is by its nature worthy of eternal death if it be not forgiven? For this evil is not merely concupiscence in the senses, nor merely a weakness or a quality of the body, but it consists of that darkness, not yet banished from the mind, which the saints have especially experienced. They have known doubts about and despair of God, nor has their will been turned toward God in complete love, for even the saints have experienced pride in and love of self. Therefore imperfection still remains in the mind and in the will and in the senses, and the saints have often lamented this. It is as Paul says, "O wretched man that I am! Who shall deliver me from the body of this death." He says that this law rages in his own members and that it has taken his mind captive. This is not an insignificant conflict.

*Several supporting texts from the Psalms are cited here* [p. 41].

For these reasons we call that evil which remains after Baptism not merely a penalty nor a thing indifferent but something which is by its very nature worthy of eternal death unless it were forgiven. Moreover, adults must have faith which fights against this evil and which seeks forgiveness. If this faith has been driven out then this evil again merits eternal death.

*A long list of texts from the Scriptures and the fathers are cited in support.*

Finally, since our belief as a whole has so many testimonies of the prophetic and apostolic Scriptures and of the learned fathers, and since it does not fall into Pelagian or Manichaean errors, it also contains nothing absurd. For we distinguish between nature and its depravity and we grant the human will its proper place, as we shall state in due time.

*With an offer to explain his statement more fully if called upon to do so, Melanchthon here concluded his first statement.*

*In the afternoon, "at the third hour after lunch," Eck began his reply to Melanchthon's first statement. Eck insisted that he could prove that the version of the Augsburg Confession presented at the colloquy differed not only in the text but also in the sense. He refused to discuss further his earlier statement that the Lutherans had "gone out from among us," but he could not understand why they gave as their reason for separating "our abuses" since in the first twenty-one articles of the Augsburg Confession they differed on matters of faith. It was improper for Melanchthon, Eck insisted, to refer to Jeremiah, who had followed the orders of his fathers and of revelation. He expressed his gratification at Melanchthon's acceptance of the Nicene Creed and Council in connection with the First Article, and his hopes that agreement might yet be reached* [pp. 43, 44].

Eck [p. 44]: As regards the Second Article it is also pleasing that we agree in rightly defining original sin against both the old and the new Pelagians. I would like, however, a fuller explanation of my lord Magister's definition of original sin in which he claimed that original sin was not only the lack of original righteousness but also of other gifts, some of which he enumerated. For the holy fathers in setting forth the canonical Scriptures expressed the opinion that if an infant were endowed with that original righteousness, even if he lacked the other

ifts, no original sin would be in him. It was also debated whether the first reature Adam was created with the grace that saves, although of his original ighteousness there can be no doubt. In this, however, I agree with my lord Iagister: that an infant lacking this original righteousness is lacking also in iany good qualities both before and after Baptism. If this is his opinion we are ightly agreed.

Moreover, what he confessed in his response about the difference between riginal and actual sin we receive with approval. It would seem that only youths vould disagree with this. Therefore we also accept what he said about the perverse eart, but we are led astray at that moment when lust reigns in our body and we bey it. Then we feel the tendency of the spirit toward evil and we realize the ruth of what God said, "The imagination of man's heart is evil from his youth" Gen. 8:21].

On this point we confess that those good attributes, namely, knowledge, love, tc., of which my lord Magister spoke, would have remained in original righteous- ess. Moreover, we would have lacked that tendency toward evil. I do not under- tand, however, what was claimed about the guilt which remains after Baptism nd that through it the dignity of Baptism is increased. That it should not be ufficient for the destruction of all the guilt of sin seems rather to tend toward n insult of Baptism—indeed, an insult of Christ who is the institutor of Baptism. On the contrary Paul, writing so learnedly to Titus, commends to us the excellence f Baptism, saying, "According to his mercy he saved us by the washing of egeneration and renewing of the Holy Spirit, which he shed on us abundantly hrough Jesus Christ our Saviour, that being justified by his grace, we should e made heirs according to the hope of eternal life" [Tit. 3:5-7].

The apostle witnesses to this—that we are saved and that the Holy Spirit as been abundantly poured out upon us—but there would be no abundance if ny guilt remained in us. We Christians confess that the obedience of the one Christ has brought us more grace than the disobedience of Adam brought guilt. The same thing seems to apply to what my lord Magister said about this sin concupiscence] being forgiven if one grasps forgiveness through faith, although e does not seem to take into consideration children who die before the age of eason. And if it is forgiven through faith, then the sacrament of Baptism has gain been degraded. And not only this, but they yield to new doctrines through vhich they impose on us a perpetual sin of concupiscence. But if they are un- villing to accept that Baptism is the remedy of this guilt, then let them acknowl- edge that through their strong faith that sin is not perpetual.

It would therefore seem to be a greater help toward agreement if they vould confess, together with the church in general, that concupiscence before Baptism entails both guilt and penalty, but that after Baptism it entails a penalty only or, as Augustine used to say, a sickness.

*Eck cited a long list of supporting texts from Augustine, Jerome, Ambrose, nd Paul. In a concluding remark Eck called upon everyone to say and believe*

*the same thing about Baptism "so that peace and concord may prevail in our churches"* [pp. 45-47].

*On the following day, Saturday, January 15, 1541, at 8* A.M. *Melanchthon continued the colloquy with his response to Eck's first reply. Melanchthon said, "first," that he would reply elsewhere to Eck's continued claims about the different versions of the Augsburg Confession.*

MELANCHTHON [p. 47]: Second, Dr. Eck hoped for a similar agreement on the other articles as on the first. We truly and sincerely hope for the same thing, namely, that we shall be united by the Word of God in the same manner in which we agreed on the First Article. I should hope that it would be possible to establish such agreement if we were to have the proper judges, as one can notice with regard to the Second Article on which reconciliation would seem to be easy. A pious and candid judge can truly see that definitions rightly understood will not disagree. Agreement on the subject of sin in the saints will be easy later in another place if anyone will consider the teaching of Paul on this question and observe the movements in his own mind. Who among us does not heartily grieve that he is troubled with doubts about God, that he does not fear him enough, that he does not glow with his love, that he follows much human advice without calling upon him, and that he is consumed by other evil feelings? Even though perfect agreement may not be reached on these points, the believing soul will know these feelings to be sins and will grieve over them and seek forgiveness. Agreement on this point is therefore not difficult. And would that the ruling princes would hear the prayers and groans of the pious among all nations who hope that the churches may be advised correctly.

*Melanchthon expressed his and his party's appreciation to the emperor for having arranged this colloquy.*

Thirdly, Dr. Eck said that in my definitions I attribute more gifts to the original just state of man than is proper. And he gave an example: If an infant were given original righteousness and he lacked any guilt, he would nevertheless not have the other gifts. I respond: I do not think the lord Doctor wishes original sin to consist merely in guilt and not also in a state of being turned away from God. It should be stated this way: Righteousness consists not merely of the acceptance by but also of the turning toward God with all one's powers (we are speaking of original righteousness). This necessarily includes those gifts: God's light in the mind, the turning of the will toward God, and the proper arrangement of all other powers. An infant would have all these if it were endowed with original righteousness, unless the lord Doctor wishes righteousness to be understood to consist merely of acceptance by God, which I do not think he does.

Further, just as there is a difference between sin and its penalty (namely, death and whatever death includes, i.e., the inactivity of the powers of the spirit and the body and the devil's tyranny raging against the body or raging in some other way), thus also there is a difference between original righteousness and the gifts added to it, namely, immortality and the manifold talents of the mind and of the other powers. But original righteousness, unless he would wish it to mean

ere acceptance by God, would also consist of the correct orientation of all powers ward God. Among these the three qualities I have mentioned are necessarily cluded. Nor do the fathers seem to have wished to express it differently, since ey define this sin as the lack of that righteousness which should be present, or concupiscence, or as ignorance of the mind and disobedience of the will. They so say that original righteousness consists of the right orientation of one's powers .e. toward God), or as Gregory Nazianzen said, that this was the "image of od." That all these points agree seems to be apparent enough, and I hope that e lord Doctor is satisfied. Certainly I do not believe that he will approve what ccam said, that he would say that original sin is merely guilt if he were not evented by the authority of the fathers.

Fourth, even though we are not here dealing principally with my own writings ut with the general doctrine of our churches, nevertheless, if any error on my art should be brought up, I shall answer frankly and shall gladly yield to those ho can point out something better. Further, since the lord Doctor said that he ceived with approval our distinction between original and actual sins, I am uly able to affirm that this distinction is carefully preserved in our churches and ill always be. Someone else might perhaps have expressed it somewhat better. n fact, our works are extant in which Augustine is praised because he more arefully handed on the distinctions of these terms than his predecessors had done.

*Melanchthon here presented a long list of point by point refutations of Eck's rguments, based on citations and discussions of biblical and patristic texts bearing n the subject. Melanchthon pointed out the difference between Origen and ugustine on original sin and expressed his conviction that Eck also rejected the rmer's teaching and followed that of the latter father. Then Melanchthon pro-eeded to consider St. Paul's teaching, as expressed in Romans 7, "on the purpose the law, on the freeing that comes through grace, and on the depravity that emains, over which, however, grace abounds." Quoting Paul directly Melanchthon ontinued* [pp. 49-52]:

"I was once alive without the law, that is, in my self-confidence I did not feel ne terror of the law, but when the commandment came, sin revived and I died" Rom. 7:9]. That is, knowing my sin I was oppressed by the fear of death and y the law's judgment. This is the first part in which Paul preaches the purpose f the law. Then he touches on the struggle of man, reborn after these conflicts. his is in a logical sequence, and as he spoke about himself at the beginning, so e also speaks of himself later. And the text can certainly not be understood xcept of him who had already begun his rebirth, since he says a little later, "For delight in the law of God after the inward man" [Rom. 7:22]. This cannot be aid by anybody who is not yet reborn. He says that sin consists of this, and he nows it sufficiently when he plainly adds that sin wars against the law of the ind, against the law of God [Rom. 7:23].

Therefore no other meaning can be given to the word "sin," as when the lord Doctor suggested an analogy in stating that it is called sin because it is done rough a sin—although this has its place too. For as we have cited from Augustine

before, this evil is called sin and also sin's cause and sin's punishment. But Paul speaks here of that depravity which wars against the law of God. That this is called sin because of its very nature it should not be difficult for anyone to see.

To this there follows that other belief about which my lord Doctor reprehended and reproved me, that the tendency of the flesh is enmity against God. It would be the same if he preferred to say "wisdom of the flesh," for Paul is surely speaking about those worldly or rationalistic views which man has according to his corrupted nature, as well as about those movements of his will which correspond to those errors. This is more significantly called *phronema* in the [Greek] text[2] than "wisdom" in the ordinary [Latin] version, but I am not going to argue about words. We are debating serious matters here, and much depends on this text. Christ's beneficial effect cannot be seen fully unless the evil is fully known. But as soon as the rationalistic view is accepted according to which concupiscence or depravity in the mind and the will and the senses, and the sinful desires which they call "first inclinations," are not sins, then erroneous speculations at once arise about the law: that men are justified through the law, that they satisfy the law, etc.

However, there can be no doubt that that which is called enmity toward God is by its very nature sin. By what more terrible name could it be called? We have sufficient outstanding testimony in favor of our view.

*Melanchthon cited a list of supporting texts* [pp. 53-54].

Lastly, the lord Doctor proposed that we say that the guilt is removed in Baptism. We respond: We have testified clearly enough that the guilt is removed, but we shall never approve the softening of this to the point of confessing that the evil that is left over is only a penalty.

Further, it is my wish that the lord Doctor may understand that I desire to speak with him no less candidly than when I speak daily in my prayers with God.

Certainly when I ponder my own doubts, when I realize how far I am from the fear and love of God which God demands, I cannot judge these to be merely punishments. I confess and know them to be sins, and therefore the whole church prays, "Forgive us our trespasses." For this reason I cannot agree with the proposed softening of the doctrine. I rather pray that Christians may agree with the Scriptures and with their consciences, for they recognize by themselves in their daily life that these evils are not merely punishments but are by their very nature sins, but that these sins are forgiven the saints who through faith seek forgiveness.

*After citing texts from Augustine, Micah, and Ezekiel, Melanchthon here concluded his second statement.*

*At two o'clock in the afternoon Eck continued the colloquy. Eck promised to be briefer. He pointed out that Melanchthon had raised the question as to the significance of doubt in the mind and an absence of fear and love of God. Then he discussed the subject of the first inclinations to sin.*

Eck [p. 55]: The lord Magister descends after the long course of his oration to the same material, that those inclinations which theologians are accustomed

2 See S. D. du Cange, *Glossarium Mediae et Infimae Latinitatis* (Paris, 1840-1857), V, 238

) call "first inclinations" place man in enmity with God, which he wished to rove through the cited text of the apostle Paul concerning the knowledge of the esh, *phronema,* concupiscence, the corruption and illness thereof. But I call on ie wisdom of all of you present here as witness. Who will think, on the basis of iese first inclinations themselves, that he has committed a serious sin? Since obody is without them and they arise in us even though we are unwilling, he nevertheless a good man who, when aroused by these inclinations to greed, dultery, revenge, or other crimes, resists them manfully under the guidance of is reason and by the help of God, so that he may not obey the rule of the lusts f such inclinations. How much more correctly and in accordance with the opinion f the holy fathers would the lord Magister have spoken if he had said that the rst inclinations, if they are not consented to, do not incur the guilt of sin. Al- iough I should not think that the lord Collocutor, in view of his moderation, ould wish to weigh down all men with such grave sin, nevertheless less learned reachers of the churches, understanding this concupiscence in a cruder manner, ight declare this to be a capital sin which is to be feared, and they might bind ien with an inescapable sin whenever a man, woman or honest maid were tickled y such inclinations. For if one has consented, one has committed an actual sin. f one has not consented, such preachers will still call the remaining concupiscence in. A something always avoided by the fathers lest man should be confused about ie most perfect law of Christ, even as Gerson, a theologian venerated among your reachers often taught in his *Morals* and elsewhere.

*Eck claimed that he had maintained the proper tone in his first speech. He isisted that he really wished to arrive at agreement with Melanchthon and his ellows. Then he spoke about the need to kill off the earthly remnants of the old dam and the need to be renewed daily.*

*In a long, detailed discussion Eck took issue with the various points raised y Melanchthon and cited many texts from the Scriptures and the fathers in sup- ort of his arguments. He concluded with the following appeal to reason* [pp. 56-62] :

After we have heard the prophets, the Gospel and apostles, and the holy athers, it is proper that we should strengthen our view with grounds taken rom reason. For where is freedom of the will if it is maintained that that is in which attacks us (and I even add: conquers us) when we are unwilling, specially since Augustine's opinion about sins, other than original, stands un- haken and firm? Sin, therefore, is what is done through one's free will; if it is ot through one's free will, it is not sin.

Further, in opposition to the same point, no commandment ought to be given xcept with reference to good and evil. But if this sin of concupiscence is in- oluntary, then no commandment can be given about it. The conclusion of reason n this matter is handed down by Augustine in his first book *On Christian Doctrine* and also in his statements on grace and free will: "God's commandments vould be of no value to man if he did not have free will."

It is therefore evident that every Christian ought to act in accordance with God's commandments; otherwise he cannot obtain eternal life. Augustine sets this

forth in his book *On the Spirit and the Letter.* If anyone does not keep God's commandments, those curses will come upon him that are mentioned in Deuteronomy [28:15-68]. To avoid these inconveniences it is more than enough to recognize the force and effectiveness of Baptism, with many praises to follow up the merit of Christ given in Baptism, not to afflict the innocence of infants after Baptism with a more than Herodian savagery but to thank God who restored innocence to infants. And we adults, who often consent to our concupiscence which falsely tempts us, but then (through divine help, for which we beseech God) strongly resist the temptations, shall be crowned by God, the Best and Greatest, in eternal blessedness.

I have wished to bring out these things in this way so that I might satisfy my lord Collocutor and that I might add those things which pertain to this matter. I ask again and again that he may be willing to accept a formula of agreement that is tolerable to us and by which means the peace of the churches in Germany may happily be restored and the members thereof edified. For this I pray.

*On the next day, Sunday, January 16, at 3* P.M., *there was a discussion between Dr. Conrad Braun, the representative of the presidents, and Melanchthon about shortening his presentation. The presidents felt that there had been enough discussion of the Second Article. Braun finally declared that the presidents would announce their decision about the discussion of the remaining articles on the next day. This meant that the stage was being set for the closing of this colloquy and its postponement until the colloquy to be held at Ratisbon during the summer. After Braun's declaration Melanchthon made his last reply at this colloquy.*

*Melanchthon stated that there were two things against which he wished to protest. Eck was using terms ambiguously and perverted the Lutherans' teaching on infant Baptism. Eck also argued jokingly and abusively. He had spoken of* "Herodian savagery." *Melanchthon emphasized that infant Baptism was maintained and practiced among the Lutherans. He insisted that he recognized Eck's learning and candor, but he demanded that the disputation be carried on without harshness or sophistry* [p. 65].

MELANCHTHON [p. 66]: Now I come to my response. First I shall discuss terms. Crime is an actual, definite sin and act by which the law of God is violated in opposition to one's conscience; with this there is no grace. Nor do we call evil desires in the saints against which they struggle crimes. The confusion of which we spoke is most clearly explained through our doctrine of justification. We have shown in what manner obedience is pleasing, even though it be incomplete. Again we say that righteousness and grace are lost when the law of God is violated against one's conscience. As Paul said, those who do such things shall not inherit the kingdom of God. We also distinguish between desires and their depravity. He therefore does us an injustice when he claims that we burden infants with capital sins when they seek food because of hunger or flee from the cold.

Second, he often repeats the term "capital sin," which we understand of sin whether original or actual, which reigns supreme (as Paul phrased it). But we have many times stated that those who are reborn are considered not to be under

he rule of sin but to have been forgiven. With regard to guilt, we are impressed y the ambiguity of the expression, for the ancients often used the term "guilt" or "accusation," that is, for the charge on account of which one is a defendant. More recent authorities have spoken simply of "sin," which they distinguish from ts punishment. For this reason, in order that our lord Doctor might have this evil o be only an evil and not a defect contrary to God's law, he demands that we ay that all guilt is removed through Baptism. If he wishes the term "guilt" to be nderstood only as an accusation, there is nothing in the way. But if he means hat the remnants of the depravity are only a penalty, and that they are not lefects opposed to God's law, I shall never assent. I say that this evil is too much veakened, and that other mistakes flow from such an error. For if we concede that here is no sin in the saints, then this conflicts with John's statement, "If we say hat we have no sin, we deceive ourselves" [I John 1:8]. Then there follows the antasy that men can satisfy God's law, etc. I have spoken only of the terms, and shall now also reply to the demand made yesterday with regard to guilt.

I proceed to the definition of the subject. The lord Doctor takes this to be he issue of the present controversy: whether we are correct in thus heightening riginal sin or whether the more recent writers soften it too much. For this eason he seeks to establish an antithesis between original righteousness and orig- nal sin. If he wishes to understand original righteousness as being only acceptance, nd sin only as accusation (that is, a charge or a rejection without any evil in uman nature itself), then he is being too rationalistic. The Scriptures and the athers state that righteousness is not merely acceptance but also right orientation (i.e., toward God) and that this cannot be attained without the light through vhich God is known and without the turning of the will toward God and the right rder of other powers.

*A discussion of texts from Ambrose and Augustine follows.*

I now proceed to those things that have been said about Baptism. He said hat guilt abounds if grace of the spirit is not able to forgive and abolish all guilt. The reply is short. We say that all is forgiven when man is received by God into grace. Grace, which buries all this sin under forgiveness, therefore abounds, as it s written in Rom. 6. Then spiritual newness also begins in the reborn person. Meanwhile, however, the body of sin (as Paul calls it), which fights against this ewness, remains. But this state also finally disappears when the body of sin has ome to an end. The same reasoning applies to the sacrament of penance as to hat of adult Baptism. Actual sins pass away through the act itself, as it is customary o say. They do not remain and are forgiven. But the original evil persists through he act, although it is beginning to be weakened and what remains is forgiven.

*Melanchthon presented a list of supporting texts from the Scriptures and athers and discussed them* [pp. 67-70].

Finally (and I pass over his testimonies) the lord Doctor adds arguments aken from reason and from the laws of the world, by which he proves that this vil is not sin.

First, all sin, except original, is by free will. Ergo, this evil, left over in the aints, is not sin or even evil repugnant to God's love.

I respond: Original sin is made an exception in the major premise, and the statement is made of the custom of the world.

This is the chief reason why we contend about this text, that the distinction between civil crimes and uncleanness toward God be maintained, as also between the righteousness of a citizen and the righteousness of faith.

Second argument: No commandment can be impossible of fulfillment. Ergo, either concupiscence is not a sin, or the law will be impossible to obey.

I respond to the preceding: I agree with regard to outward good manners and also that God's law, in so far as it is a matter of discipline, can also pertain to proper public obligations. But the law of God preaches not only public obligations but rather the obedience of the whole heart, that "thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart," etc. Outward good order and confession of the true religion are possible and should and can be maintained together. But none can fulfill the law which extends even to purity of the heart and to complete obedience. Therefore Paul says, "The law of God is spiritual" [Rom. 7:14]; i.e. it is not merely a social ordering, but it also makes demands on inward dispositions like the complete love of God, etc. And although this law was possible of fulfillment before the fall of Adam, depraved human nature afterwards fought against the law; and although they propose that it should be coerced through external means, sin will still accuse and damn man in his conscience. So Paul argues sharply that men are not justified by the law and preaches that the Son of God has been given as a mediator, through whom we are reconciled and made co-heirs of a new and eternal righteousness and life. John also says that the law was given by Moses but grace and truth came through Jesus Christ—i.e. the forgiveness and remission of sins and true and eternal righteousness of life. The law is again a factor when newness of life begins, according to the text, "I shall give my law into their hearts." Sins are forgiven to those who repent and believe themselves to be heard for the sake of God's Son. Nor does this weaken the free will which is able in every way to guide external order and which has a new help from the Holy Spirit toward new tendencies agreeable to God's law.

The third argument: If you wish to enter into life, keep the commandments. None is able to keep the commandment, "Thou shalt not covet," if this is understood of natural evil. Ergo, no one can be saved. I respond: This confusion of law and gospel must really be deplored. The tables of the law given to Moses announce that none can be justified before God. Therefore this text, "If you wish to enter into life, keep the commandments," is to be understood of the promised Christ, because of whom sins are forgiven and new righteousness is given. Then the application of the law is pleasing, as will be shown at the proper time.

The lord Doctor therefore said, in order that he might avoid the absurdity he had presented in his arguments, that his party so contends lest this depravity in the saints should be thought a vice fighting against God's law. We do away with such absurdities and present more serious reasons for maintaining our belief, lest we support the opinions of those who claim that men can fulfill God's law and hold other doctrines which obscure the merits of Christ.

I have done what he asked. I have spoken with my colleagues and asked each of them to state his belief, and they were all of one opinion: that all men propagated in the regular manner through the union of male and female bear with them original sin, as the church confesses. They judged that the statement of definitions which I drew up agreed with the prophetic and apostolic Scripture and with the writers of the church, and they stated that there is no disagreement on this subject. It was apparent that all confessed that original sin is forgiven in Baptism, i.e. that it is really forgiven, and that the Holy Spirit is then given, who begins newness of spiritual life. With respect to the depravity left over in the saints, they believed that it is not merely a thing indifferent or a penalty, but that it is an evil fighting against God's law which is by its nature sin, as Paul often expressly calls it sin, but it is forgiven to those who are reborn. These are plain and clear words which contain no ambiguity or deception. If this belief is satisfactory to the lord Doctor and his colleagues, we shall rejoice. We certainly do not doubt that it is the consensus of the catholic church of Christ, i.e. of the fathers, prophets, apostles, and all saints down to this day. And we believe that this belief has been handed down surely in the prophetic and apostolic Scriptures. Nor do we hesitate to call on the proper judges of the church, i.e. the good and learned in the whole world.

We are amazed that our opponents argue so strongly that men can be sinless, since Augustine called this opinion unsound, saying, "I shall never say that anyone is sinless in this life—this insanity with which the Pelagians are afflicted and disordered." This is so not because any sin remains that is not forgiven in Baptism, but because such sins do not cease to appear daily in us who are placed amid the infirmities of this life and who faithfully pray and are daily forgiven.

There are, however, two assemblies in the church. The one understands the law only in a fleshly manner and is puffed up by the conviction of its own righteousness. The other recognizes its own failings and flees to the mediator, the Son of God, and asks for and accepts forgiveness by faith. An example of each kind is presented in the supper of Simon the Pharisee [Luke 7:36-50]. When the Pharisee had condemned the poor woman and was inflated by admiration of his own holiness, Christ began to defend the woman and to denounce the arrogance of the Pharisee, he gave her forgiveness of sins and praised her for fulfilling the law, i.e. for her love. Perhaps this sort of thing is happening with us at the present time. In spite of this, persons on either side could still come to an agreement. We have spoken of the preaching of repentance, of faith and remission of sins, of the recognition of one's depravity and on right worship. We have done this that we might wash the feet of Christ, i.e. that we might adorn the ministry of the Gospel, that we might be acceptable to God because of this zeal.

*Melanchthon here concluded his last statement at the colloquy with a few unimportant closing sentences. On the next day, January 17, at 8* A.M., *Eck began his concluding statement, which was to end the colloquy.*

*Eck defended himself against Melanchthon's charge that he had argued harshly, sophistically, or jokingly. As to Melanchthon's distinction between the offense and*

*its guilt, Eck said that he would not oppose him about this "lest we fall into Scotist subtleties about offenses, obligations and injuries to God." He answered with regard to Melanchthon's statement that original sin consists in the depravity of human nature, even of the mind, that the mind suffers from the consequences of original sin* [pp. 73-77].

Eck [p. 78]: The other subjects our lord Magister brought up are not in dispute. Therefore, in the interests of brevity, I come to the conclusion. And since he presented in a friendly manner his colleagues' opinion for agreement, I also offer an opinion for us and for general agreement by the church. It is clearly confessed that all men, descended from Adam according to the law of nature are born with original sin and are thus under the wrath of God. Original sin is the lack of that original righteousness which should be present, along with concupiscence. In Baptism the guilt of original sin, and of all sins, is forgiven through the merits of Christ's passion, but the evil that remains (that exceedingly vicious concupiscence) can be called "sin" after the fashion in which someone's handwriting is called his "hand," for the consequences of sin always incline towards further sin. However, this cannot properly and formally be called damning sin.

*Illustrations from the Scriptures follow.*

We have also heard my lord Collocutor, both in his own name and in the name of his colleagues, affirm that this sin is forgiven in Baptism, that it is buried and that it is not thought of by God. But as regards the infirmity of the flesh, or the law of the members, or deadly concupiscence, since it constantly afflicts us with evil desires and lusts and incites us to sins, we pray the great God that he may assist us with his grace and may grant that we be not led into temptation but delivered from the evil of the present and future life, that we may rejoice in eternity with him who is blessed throughout the ages.

# Did Paul Turn His Back on the Jews Forever?

By Kurt Carl Hartmann

TO SKETCH the background prompting this question, through the years I have been fed on the notion that Paul "once and for all" turned his back on the Jews, and only a few days ago I read the statement once again in a devotional reading.

Often I have questioned the theory. After reading the statement in my devotional reading recently, I decided to get to the bottom of it all. Until I can convince myself otherwise on the basis of what I read in the New Testament, I am of the opinion that this is another of those traditions among us which should have been cast away long ago.

What are the facts? Is the statement correct that Paul, after a certain point in his missionary endeavors among both Jews and Gentiles, once and for all turned his back on the Jews and worked only among the Gentiles?

This is fact: "When Silas and Timothy arrived [at Corinth] from Macedonia, Paul was occupied with preaching, testifying to the Jews that the Christ was Jesus. And when they opposed and reviled him, he shook out his garments and said to them, "Your blood be upon your heads! I am innocent. From now on I will go to the Gentiles" (Acts 18:5, 6). From that day on Paul went to the Gentiles—in Corinth! The Lord told him not to fear, but to continue to work, "for I am with you, and no man shall attack you to harm you; for I [the Lord] have many people in this city" (Acts 18:9, 10). The Lord did have many people in the city of Corinth, and one of those people was a Jew. "Crispus, the ruler of the synagogue, believed in the Lord." Crispus was not alone. He believed in the Lord "together with all his household" (v. 8).

This is also a fact: Paul left the synagogue of the Jews "and went to the house of a man named Titius Justus, a worshiper of God." But Paul did not go far away. The house of Titius Justus "was next door to the synagogue" (v. 7).

This, too, is a fact: Paul "stayed a year and six months, teaching the word of God among them" (v. 11). Then is recorded the incident in Corinth "when Gallio was proconsul of Achaia" and "the Jews" on whom Paul is supposed to have turned his back once and for all "made a united attack upon Paul and brought him before the tribunal."

These Jews accused Paul as follows: "This man is persuading men to worship God contrary to the law." Gallio's response to this accusation prevented Paul from speaking in his own behalf. Now, there is something in the words of Gallio which I believe sheds light on whether or not Paul actually turned his back on the Jews. Gallio said: "If it were a matter of wrongdoing or vicious crime, I

should have reason to bear with you, O Jews; but since it is a matter of questions about words and names and your own law, see to it yourselves; I refuse to be a judge of these things" (v. 15). That is to say, "What you accuse Paul of shows me clearly that he has been saying things among you, or to you, or at least in your hearing which offend no one but you and are contrary to no laws except your own. So you handle his case as you see fit, according to your laws. If and when you file complaint that Paul is transgressing Roman laws, I'll begin to listen."

So the Jews must have been, if not the whole audience, at least a part of Paul's audience. Moreover, we read that "after this Paul stayed many days longer" (v. 18).

Where did Paul go from Corinth? He sailed for Syria. "And they came to Ephesus." Having arrived in Ephesus, where did he go? "He himself went into the synagogue and argued with the Jews." "When they asked him to stay for a longer period, he declined; but on taking leave of them he said, 'I will return to you if God wills.'"

If one continues to read the story of Paul in Acts one will note that Acts 19:8 reads, "He entered the synagogue and for three months spoke boldly," etc. It is also stated that "when some were stubborn and disbelieved, speaking evil of the Way before the congregation, he withdrew from them" (v. 9).

Finally, it is to be noted that Paul went to Jerusalem, to the temple of the Jews, and there was seized by the Jews. Eventually this brought Paul to Rome. What did Paul do in Rome? "After three days he called together the local leaders of the Jews" (Acts 28-17). "When they had appointed a day for him, they came to him at his lodging in great numbers" (v. 23). The result of this meeting was that "some were convinced by what he said, while others disbelieved" (v. 24). After referring them to a word of the Holy Spirit spoken through Isaiah the prophet, Paul said, "Let it be known to you then that this salvation of God has been sent to the Gentiles; they will listen" (v. 28). How can it be concluded that Paul turned his back on the Jews once and for all?

Let us take statement one, Acts 18:6: "Your blood be upon your heads! I am innocent. From now on I will go to the Gentiles." Leave the statement in the context and the only fair conclusion one can come to is this: Paul was now going to pay special attention to the Gentiles and was no longer going to spend time with the vicious haters of the Gospel. These vicious haters among the Jews appeared to be leaders. Paul's strategy, then, might have been to approach the leaders among the Jews first. If he could capture the leaders for Christ he would have little difficulty gaining a hearing with the rest of the people. Apparently, however, the majority of the leaders did not believe. It is these vicious haters of the Christ on whom Paul turned his back in Corinth.

In the second instance (Acts 19:9) "he withdrew from those who were stubborn and disbelieved" and who spoke "evil of the Way before the congregation."

The third case (Acts 28:28): "Let it be known to you then that this salvation of God has been sent to the Gentiles; they will listen." This does not carry

ith it the implication that Paul at that time, or later, turned his back once and r all on the Jews.

What the apostle wrote to the Roman Christians, "For I could wish that I yself were accursed and cut off from Christ for the sake of my brethren, my nsmen by race" (9:3), needs to be emphasized. To say that Paul turned his ack on the Jews forever is to do Paul a great injustice, and it does not encourage s to take the Gospel of Jesus Christ to the Jews of our day.

# The Lutheran Church in the Carolinas Sociologically Interpreted

By Wade F. Hook

AS A FOCUS of family and community life the church has long been accepted as a significant social group. The church is different in essence from all other sociological groups because membership in this group is believed to result from the action of God's grace in Jesus Christ. However, much social behavior within this group may be better understood in terms of certain sociological concepts. In support of this hypothesis historical events and current situations in the North and South Carolina Synods of the United Lutheran Church in America have been abstracted and associated with sociological terms.

The men and women who have been united in Lutheran congregations and organizations in the Carolinas have been interdependent beings in a great cooperative enterprise. They had a common faith and a common religious background. Their separation from European church organizations, procedures, and controls increased their interdependence and their drives toward social and cooperative behavior. Social interaction has been a basic process at work in the formation of the congregations and organizations and in their subsequent life and development.

Any group is constituted by the fact that there is some interest which holds its members together. The dominant interest which created and maintained cohesive units in the case of the early congregations was the eager desire for the preaching of the Word and the administration of the sacraments by an ordained Lutheran clergyman. The activities of laymen in the Organ, Dutch Buffalo Creek, and St. John's congregations in North Carolina are illustrative. In the case of the early men's organizations (German Friendly Society of Charleston, and the Christian Association of Wilmington), the paramount unifying force was the care of indigent and transient Germans. The efforts and activities of the men were combined to assure success in realizing this objective. The principle of cooperation is the fundamental principle which seems to have governed their relations from the very beginning. Following the sociological hypothesis that orientation, the individual's knowledge of the formal structure of the organization, and performance are positively related, the internal orientation of these men's organizations is considered to have been excellent. The social welfare programs of the associations in Charleston and Wilmington and the financial support given to Home Missions in North Carolina by the Brotherhood of the North Carolina Synod may be cited as evidence of performance and of the ability of the members to respond within the framework of the organization in realizing their goals.

A number of congregational situations and synodical transactions illustrate hat is known in sociological terms as conflict. This is a process-situation in which vo or more persons or groups seek actively to thwart each other's purposes and prevent satisfaction of each other's interests.[1] The leaders and the members the congregation are engaged in the conscious pursuit of exclusive values. Each roup seeks to eliminate the other. Conflict in some form usually exists in varying egrees of intensity in all congregations and their auxiliary organizations. Only ccasionally, however, are values and interests pursued by these means so that ıe conflict is recognized as such by everyone. Conflict may be either destructive r constructive. G. D. Bernheim interprets a major organizational division in the utheran Church in North Carolina as constructive conflict.

lthough divisions in the church are always to be dreaded, and, except in cases of doctrinal fferences, always to be avoided, nevertheless, when they do occur, they sometimes effect good vitalizing dormant energies, and in re-establishing the pure faith of the Gospel. Such was the se in this division; it increased the number of ministers, it provided for the wants of so many eglected congregations, it made ministers and laymen all the more energetic, zealous, and thful in the discharge of their duties, and it resulted in an enlarged increase in the strength the church.[2]

he division to which he refers is the split which occurred at the synod convenon in Lincolnton, N. C., May 29, 1820. The Tennessee Synod was organized llowing this convention, and it continued for a hundred years to conduct its own ctivities and to be the administrative unit for a number of congregations in the ame geographical area as that served by the North Carolina Synod. Competition, efined as rivalry for power and prestige, is also found in some form in all church ongregations and organizations. It may be socializing or desocializing, depending pon the means that are used to express it.

Most ministers could present case studies to document individualism in the fe of the church. It is not uncommon for the attitudes and policies of congregaions to give priority to the individual person or personality rather than to ongregational harmony and welfare. This leads to disorganization and authoritarianism. A person is never an absolute individualist, of course, because he individual and society interact in one way or another. Charles H. Colley considers individuality desirable and inevitable in all groups. He assumes that through ooperation and intimate association the individual will feel an allegiance to ommon objectives and goals. In cases of extreme individualism, the person eparates himself from the group—family, neighborhood, or church. This explanaion accounts for some of the lapsed members on church rolls.

Church leaders, like sociologists, economists, and others, may define certain ituations as crises. Any disturbance of equilibrium may be defined as a crisis. The

1 Definition of Charles J. Bushnell, quoted by Henry Pratt Fairchild, *Dictionary of Sociology* New York: Philosophical Library, 1944), p. 58.

2 G. D. Bernheim, *History of the Tennessee Synod,* cited by Jacob L. Morgan, *History of he Lutheran Church in North Carolina* (Salisbury: United Evangelical Lutheran Synod of North Carolina, 1953), p. 49.

Revolutionary and Civil Wars are examples of crises which had unifying and consolidating effects in the Lutheran groups of the Carolinas. Social groups are in general solidified and strengthened as a result of the crisis experience. The economic depression in the 1930's is an example of another crisis which had cohesive effects in uniting North Carolina laymen in an ambitious financial campaign for $100,000. Through persistence and perseverance the campaign was completed in 1947. In these instances the dangers which threatened the group heightened and increased voluntary cooperation.

At the same time that our in-groupness was being strengthened by the hardships and stresses of the Civil War, prejudices and attitudes which almost closed the door of a Lutheran ministry to southern Negroes were developed and intensified. Race prejudice is "an antipathetic attitude toward an individual or group predicated upon traits or characteristics which are, or are erroneously believed to be, racial in origin, but without any adequate foundation in fact or experiential acquaintance."[3] At its annual meeting of 1814 the North Carolina Synod passed the following resolution: "Resolved that it is our duty to preach the Gospel to the Negroes, and after proper instruction to admit them to all the means of grace of the church, and for this purpose to make room for them in our churches."[4] Negro accessions and communicants in the South Carolina Synod for the years prior to the Civil War and immediately following the war are shown in Table I. The Negro communicants dropped from 954 in 1862 to 144 in 1868. Comparable records for the North Carolina Synod during the pre-war years are not available, but in 1867 only thirty-three Negroes were listed as communicant members of the Evangelical Lutheran Synod of North Carolina. Today there are no Negroes in segregated or non-segregated churches included in the communicant membership of these two synods. Prejudices with all of their emotional implications have resulted in attitudes and performances which are not in keeping with the official resolutions and statements of the church in the area of human relations. New Testament imperatives and absolutes have been replaced by emotional attitudes acquired in advance of adequate evidence and experience.

There is evidence in church records to support the theory, found in the works of Georg Simmel, Leopold von Wiese, and others, that the size of social grouping affects its internal relationships. Simmel's theory is that disadvantages for cohesion and unity follow from mere numerical increase. When groups change quantitatively, the inter-relationships of the members also change. Members in larger groups have a different relationship than members in smaller ones have. Personal interdependence and intimacy decrease with numerical increase. There were four ministers and fourteen lay delegates present at the organizational meeting of the North Carolina Synod in 1803. In 1820, when the dissension and division which resulted in the organization of the Tennessee Synod was manifested, there were thirty-four

3 Definition of Ray E. Baber, quoted by Henry Pratt Fairchild, *Dictionary of Sociology* (New York: Philosophical Library, 1944), p. 246.

4 Minutes of the United Evangelical Lutheran Synod of North Carolina, Organ Church, Rowan County, 1814, p. 23.

TABLE I

EMBERSHIP DISTRIBUTION OF NEGROES IN CHURCHES OF THE EVANGELICAL LUTHERAN SYNOD OF SOUTH CAROLINA BETWEEN 1850 AND 1868.

| *Year* | *Number of Adult Accessions (Negro) Reported* | *Number of Communicants (Negro) Reported* |
|---|---|---|
| 1850 | 61 | 424 |
| 1851 | 88 | 432 |
| 1852 | 233 | 635 |
| 1853 | 160 | 683 |
| 1854 | 117 | 789 |
| 1855 | 138 | 815 |
| 1856 | 103 | 764 |
| 1857 | 249 | 851 |
| 1858 | 150 | 832 |
| 1859 | 189 | 969 |
| 1860 | 118 | 952 |
| 1861 | 131 | 954 |
| 1862 | 44 | 845 |
| 1863 | 111 | 740 |
| 1864 | 153 | 825 |
| 1865 | 41 | 385 |
| 1866 | 49 | 383 |
| 1867 | 80 | 212 |
| 1868 | 29 | 144 |
| 1869 | (Discontinued separate classification of Negro members) | |

inisters and laymen present, an increase of 52.9 per cent. During the early ears, when they were smaller in number, the pastors and congregations had main- ined more informal relationships. Usually numerical increase in groups involves ie admission of heterogeneous elements. This was true of the North Carolina ynod. The Rev. Gottlieb Shober figures prominently in the North Carolina Synod ontroversy of 1820. He served several Lutheran congregations in the vicinity of alem (now Winston-Salem), N. C. Although he served as a minister of Lu- ieran congregations and for nine terms as president of the North Carolina Synod, e was a member of the Moravian Church and remained in communion with this nurch throughout his life. He tended to give more emphasis to a united Prot- stantism than some of his contemporaries, who were more interested in perpetuat- ig distinctive Lutheran doctrines and historic practices of the Lutheran Church, ould support. Shober is one example of including into a group membership (Lu- ieran Synod of North Carolina) a person of diverse background and of the conse- uent effects when such a structural difference occurs.

Numerical extension and increase in volume inevitably mean a decline in unity, armony, and cohesion. The roles of certain prominent members (leaders) change ith quantitative changes. The effectiveness of their leadership also changes. In ne congregation, where the net membership gain was 66.7 per cent for a three

year period, certain leaders revealed in personal interviews that they were frustrated by the roles which the new situation demanded. When the complete responsibility for the success of a given project or area of the parish program no longer rested with them, they felt not needed and defeated. They now had a different significance in the group. The increased numbers had shattered their feelings of indispensableness. Solidarity, unity, inner cohesion, and harmony in defining goals and objectives had been reduced in the congregation.

According to available statistics for 1955, one hundred eighteen congregations of the North Carolina Synod reported 3,107 Brotherhood members. The average congregational membership was 26. Nineteen congregations with memberships over 500 reported an average Brotherhood membership of only 41. An understanding of the sociological concept of social participation suggests a partial explanation for this. This term, social participation, is described by Thomas Dawes Eliot as interaction through thorough identification of the personality with the group through shared feelings of affection and loyalty, joint responsibility, sentiment, tradition, and personal friendship.[5] Direct participation implies that the individual is or feels himself to be in a significant personal relation to all or most of the fellow members of the group. It is difficult to have ego involvement in a group such as the men's organization of a church for more than thirty or perhaps forty members. There are not enough committees or projects successfully to involve more than this number. Task completion by another person than oneself does not often bring real satisfaction. Gordon W. Allport distinguishes between activity and participation and between task involvement and ego involvement. One may constantly be task involved and never really ego involved.[6] An unstated, and perhaps unconscious, objective of the Brotherhood is to give prestige, self-regard, and self-respect to its members. When one does not find one's activity meaningful, that is, when one does not really participate, the result is absenteeism and eventually a lapsed member. This principle is true in all social groups. It applies not only to the Brotherhood organization, but also to the congregation as well. Closely related to social participation is the term, "communicative behavior." C. A. Ellwood terms "communication" the chief factor in the unity and continuity of human groups. In a congregation or organization within a congregation, communicative behavior means advancement and progress. The members are in a state of readiness for interstimulation and interresponse. Because of geographical proximity and persistence in the continuance of the German language, face to face communicative behavior was carried on freely in the early German communities and had integrative effects in their congregations. Communication which must be maintained through a group spokesman or through letter-writing does not have the same results as person to person communication. Problems relating to morale and efficiency in church organizations at the district, state, and national levels are better understood in the light of this principle.

5 Definition quoted by Henry Pratt Fairchild, *op. cit.*, p. 287.

6 Gordon W. Allport, "The Psychology of Participation," in *Nature of Personality* (Cambridge: Addison-Wesley Press, 1950), pp. 142-156.

William Graham Sumner's "we-group" or "in-group" concept, representing ıy group association with which one feels strongly identified, finds documentation the Lutheran settlements of North and South Carolina. Strong attitudes of yalty, devotion, cooperation, exclusiveness, and pride characterize the early ɔmmunities and congregations. The German settlers were drawn together by the nguage and customs of their homeland. They were further differentiated by their rong attachment to the Lutheran faith. As a rule German immigrants were poor ıd had to seek the cheap and plentiful frontier lands. When they selected farm nds, it was done in such a way as to have a number of German families locate the same area. Having close German neighbors was conducive to strong feelings loyalty and also to the perpetuation of German mores and folkways. German hools and German services were continued. The people were all agriculturists and d not enter other occupations. They were in general rather poorly informed about ıblic affairs. A general characterization of the German colonists in the Carolinas given by G. D. Bernheim:

ıese German settlers were all industrious, economical, and thrifty farmers, not afraid nor hamed of hard labor, and were soon blessed with an abundance of everything which the ·tile soil and temperate climate of that portion of North Carolina could furnish them. As they ere all agriculturists, they generally avoided settling themselves in towns; uninformed in the ays of the world, ignorant of the English language, and unacquainted with the shrewdness cessary for merchandising, yet well informed in their own language and well read in their bles and other devotional German books, they remained at their own country homes, and riched themselves with the productions of the soil.[7]

hey developed a kind of ethnocentrism. They were superior farmers and they ıdged outsiders on the basis of their success in agricultural pursuits. They were w abiding and had high moral standards. This nourished their pride and vanity. he Rev. Arnold Roshen noted in correspondence in 1789 that no German had ver been at the whipping post in Salisbury, N. C., and that no German had ever een hanged in Salisbury.[8] Their intense internal organization and loyalty and ceptical attitude concerning outsiders is illustrated by their feeling about mar-age outside the in-group (German community). Roshen, expressing the disdain hich his parishioners felt for the other groups, said in his letters in 1789:

mong the things to be especially emphasized for the younger people before this confirmation as the admonishment not to contract any marriages with the English or the Irish. And even ough this may seem very unreasonable to a European, it is in this region a very important atter. For in the first place, the Irish in this section are lazy, dissipated, and poor, live in the ost wretched huts and enjoy the same food as their animals (although in the cities this

7 G. D. Bernheim, *History of the German Settlements and of the Lutheran Church in North d South Carolina.* (Philadelphia: Lutheran Book Store, 1872), pp. 153-154.

8 Letter of Arnold Roshen, cited by William K. Boyd and Charles A. Krummel, "German racts Concerning the Lutheran Church in North Carolina during the Eighteenth Century" orrespondence with the Rev. Johann Casper Velthusen, Professor of Theology in Julius harles University at Helmstedt, Duchy of Brunswick), *North Carolina Historical Review,* II, No. 2, p. 245.

matter is reversed). In the second place, it is very seldom that German and English blood is happily united in wedlock. Dissensions and feeble children are often the result. The English wife will not permit her husband to be master in his household, and when he likewise insists upon his rights crime and murder ensue. In the third place, the English of this region do not adhere to any definite religion, do not have their children christened; nor do they send them to any school, but simply let them grow up like domestic animals. Finally, we owe it to our native country to do our part that German blood and the German language be preserved and more and more disseminated in America, for which the present indications in these regions are very favorable.[9]

The ethnocentric views and the in-group sentiments furnish a partial explanation for the fact that revivals, the proselyting encroachments of other denominations, and traveling preachers found few converts in these communities. The fanatical preachers were for the outsiders.

Of sociological significance also is the shift in the leadership roles after the arrival of the first clergymen in North Carolina. Before their arrival laymen were preaching, administering Holy Communion, requiring public penance at services, and receiving members into the church through confirmation. The ordained ministers immediately assumed the duties of preaching and administering the sacraments. Pastor Roschen describes in the Helmstedt letters how he convinced the laymen of his charge to discontinue public penance. Individual pastoral counseling in cases of dissension in family groups and the handling of moral transgressions by the minister and a small group of the church officers or members replaced open confession before the congregation. Admission to Holy Communion and confirmation by an unordained person was declared invalid by a synod resolution in 1811:

No person, from now on, who has been confirmed or admitted to the Holy Communion by an unordained preacher can be considered a member of our church or be admitted to the Holy Communion until he has confessed the mistake he made and has been confirmed by a regularly ordained minister.[10]

This is an example of accommodative behavior, involving a change in function of custom in the interests of better adjustment. The laymen assumed a subordinate role in the interest of group welfare. This subordination did not seem to damage the clerical-lay relationship. It was accepted in the interest of the unity of the congregation (the community of believers or the body of Christ). Park and Burgess note that it is only through the assuming of superordinate and subordinate roles that the group receives the inner firmness which transforms the mere combination of men into working units.[11] Complementary social behavior expressed

9 *Ibid.* This information is taken from communications to the Rev. Mr. Nicolai, dated from April 29 to June 21, 1789, at North Carolina, Rowan County on Abbot's Creek in the midst of the forests of North Carolina, eleven German miles from the Bauren Mountains and three German miles from Salem.

10 *Minutes of the United Evangelical Lutheran Synod of North Carolina,* Newberry, South Carolina, 1811, p. 15.

11 Robert E. Park and Ernest W. Burgess, *Introduction to the Science of Sociology* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1921), pp. 691-692.

rough role taking gives strength to the group and relieves tensions. In congrega-onal life, in general, minority opinions and groups must subordinate themselves the majority in the interests of unity and totality.

Accommodative behavior on the part of the early ministers may also be recog-ized. They willingly adopted the marriage and funeral customs which they bserved upon arrival. Marriages took place at a much younger age than in Ger-any and often without the consent of the parents. When the couple had a license, ne ministers did not usually hesitate in performing the ceremony regardless of ge or parental consent. In their personal habits, the ministers took on English aircuts and discarded wigs, dressing-gowns, and other luxuries. They learned uickly from their fellow planters how to manage their own farms and how to ake utensils and clothing by hand at home. Adolph Nussmann, the first Lu-eran minister in North Carolina, married after he arrived in North Carolina. le advised the Helmstedt professors to send single preachers who would marry merican wives. At least one minister, J. G. Ahrend (Arends), became the owner f numerous plantations and slaves. These accommodations contributed to the de-elopment of an Americanized Lutheran Church in North Carolina.

The whole role learning and role definition process has significance for con-regational inter-relationships. It is a fallacy to assume that a particular office or osition (Brotherhood president, chairman of the church council, or departmental unday school superintendent) is associated with a set of rights and duties about hich there is common understanding and agreement. Role collision explains a onsiderable amount of the self-asserting emotions, rumor, gossip, complaints, and cape-goating with which the professional church leader (minister) must contend.

When historical events, as well as current situations in the church, are mplified in terms of such sociological concepts as cooperation, interaction, dominant nterest, internal orientation and performance, conflict, competition, individualism, risis, prejudice, participation, communication, we-group and accommodative be-avior, certain insights may be acquired and congregational goals may be ap-roached and realized more successfully. Through such a sociological analysis, our yes may be opened to the fact that Christians have to live and function not as egos" but as "participants in community." History is more than the record of vents in chronological sequence. Back of these events are human beings associated ith one another and involved in the dynamic process of social change.

# Book Reviews and Notices[1]

*The Theology of the Old Testament.* By Edmond Jacob. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1958. $5.00.

This book contains a summary statement of the various concepts contained in the Old Testament. After giving a brief introduction in which he reviews the history of the subject of Old Testament theology and discusses the place of the subject in relation to other branches of Old Testament study and to other theological studies, the author presents the subject matter under three divisions: the characteristics of the God of the Old Testament, the action of God according to the Old Testament, and the opposition to and final triumph of God's work.

Throughout the book the author has made use of the results of critical and scientific knowledge available for the understanding of the Old Testament. His approach and viewpoint are best illustrated by the following statement: "A theology of the Old Testament which is founded not on certain isolated verses, but on the Old Testament as a whole, can only be a Christology, for what is revealed under the old covenant, through a long and varied history, in events, persons, and institutions is, in Christ, gathered together and brought to perfection." Throughout the book he has treated the subject as an historical subject.

As one reads through this work one gains a new appreciation of the uniqueness of the unity of thought and message of the Old Testament, as well as of the uniqueness of the faith of Israel set against the background of the religions of Israel's neighbors. Israel's faith was a faith that came through the revelation of God in the historical events. The Old Testament concepts came into being and developed out of the awareness of God acting in history.

The author regards the writers of the Old Testament as being real theologians—this in opposition to the commonly expressed view that the Hebrew writers were not particularly noted as great thinkers or philosophers, but rather observed the realities of life and recorded them objectively. The latter is undoubtedly true, but the theology of these great personalities is reflected in the manner in which they recorded the realities of life and thus pointed up their concepts of God and man. The fact is that there is an Old Testament theology and this is so because the writers were intensely religious men and had a distinct theology.

The arrangement of the subject matter of the book departs from the customary arrangement of most books on this subject, which is usually according to the divisions of Systematic Theology. The treatment is entirely on the basis of what the Old Testament presents. The author finds in the Old Testament a unity of thought and message which becomes the background for the New Testament. Thus he sees unity in the whole of Scriptures.

The author's treatment of the concept of the Covenant seems to be lacking in the clarity with which he treats other concepts. He does not take into account the historical background of covenant-making, which is now known through archeological data and which has been presented so excellently by Mendenhall.

In his treatment of the concept of the kingship in Israel he takes sharp issue with the kingship theory of Mowinckel and the Uppsala school of Old Testament scholars which has interpreted the kingship of Israel as being a part of the cultic and ritualistic traditions of the whole ancient Near East. He asserts that it is "not possible to find this pattern as such in the Old Testament." He defends emphatically and effectively the view that the kingship was both of divine and of popular origin, and that the anointing was "not a communication of an extraordinary power of life," but "a gesture expressing the king's belonging to Yahweh."

1 Books reviewed or noticed in these pages may be purchased through your church's publication house.

On the basis of this view he explains the development of the Messianic concept.

Following the discussion of each topic is a valuable bibliography. It is only regrettable that most of this bibliography is of German and French works, and therefore beyond the use of those who are not versed in these languages.

The book is a translation of *Theologie de l'Ancien Testament,* published in 1955. The author has been Old Testament professor in the faculty of Protestant Theology at the University of Strasbourg.

C. A. ANDERSON

*The World of the Old Testament.* By Cyrus H. Gordon. Garden City, N. Y.: Doubleday & Company, Inc., 1958. 312 pages. $3.95.

This book is a revised edition of Gordon's *Introduction to Old Testament Times* (1953), and is intended as a textbook for his course on the subject. The main concern is to place ancient Israel and its literature preserved in the Bible in the context of the Eastern Mediterranean cultures as we know them from recent discoveries. The book presents, consequently, a "comprehensive survey" of Old Testament times, into which new contributions are integrated. Since the subject is a very large one, the 312 pages present necessarily an extremely compressed survey, on the one hand, and a highly selective group of new contributions, on the other. Nearly all are Gordon's own new ideas, and one frequently receives the false impression that Gordon has ceased to read the works of other scholars in his own field. Noth's important *History of Israel* is referred to but once. The epoch-making contributions of Albrecht Alt are not cited a single time, and Albright's pioneering and fundamental works in precisely the field which Gordon discusses are not even mentioned.

As an introduction to the present radically new departures in Old Testament studies, contrasting sharply with the older so-called Higher Criticism (hardly mentioned), this work is useful, though frequently misleading. When Israel's history is placed in a larger historical context, certainly a necessary procedure for any serious scholar these days, the comparative method is inevitably full of uncertainties, and is only in its infancy even though it began with the pan-Arabism and pan-Babylonianism of the late 19th and early 20th centuries. Gordon's theories are far too frequently presented as facts, especially since he has often not succeeded in convincing other competent scholars. When he converts the patriarchs, for example, from primitive Bedouin to ancient traveling salesmen, he is going in the right direction, but much too far on the most flimsy of evidence. The time is certainly past when Abraham and Jacob can be regarded as primitive nomads, but that does not justify making them the equivalent of members of the New York Stock Exchange. Again, there can be no doubt that the Aegean world was in close cultural contact with the Near East in the patriarchal period, but to construct a new pan-Caphtorianism on this basis is absurd. The Aegean had been a province of Near Eastern culture since the Neolithic period, and the cultural contacts of the Near East by 1800 B.C. reach as far as South Germany. Overhasty generalizations about the influence of the Philistines on Israel are, therefore, certainly inappropriate in our present limited state of knowledge, though it must be admitted that the Philistines *may* have had more influence than was thought. We know, however, next to nothing about their culture from direct evidence. Gordon's insistence upon the importance of the Epic form is also highly dubious, since the term can be used only figuratively as a designation for the early Israelite traditions. Most important, he seems to be completely unaware that the faith of early Israel may have had something to do with the specific nature of early Israelite religious traditions and historiography.

This characteristic confidence in highly theoretical reconstruction combines with an historical and theological naïveté to make the book unsatisfactory for non-specialists. It is certainly, for example, naïve to say that Ezra must have preceded Nehemiah because the practical administrator was necessary to straighten out the confusion produced by the impractical scribe. Administrative impracticality is usually the least of ecclesiastical vices, but this evidently lies com-

pletely outside Gordon's realm of experience. Similarly naïve is his use of the patriachal genealogies as a basis for chronology.

The book, nevertheless, is full of suggestions which illustrate very well the fact that the Bible can no longer be understood apart from its context in history. The reviewer would insist even more strongly that it cannot be understood, either, apart from its own religious context in the faith of ancient Israel. Borrowings from foreign sources are always, in any culture, adapted to fit into an existing cultural and religious structure—but of that structure Gordon seems to know very little and care less. The veil remains unlifted.

GEORGE E. MENDENHALL

*The Acts of the Apostles.* By C. S. C. Williams. Harper's New Testament Commentaries. New York: Harper & Brothers. 300 pages. $4.00.

When *The Epistle to the Romans* in the new Harper series, written by C. K. Barrett, appeared in 1957, the present reviewer was hopeful that we were now to be presented with a new and fresh set of commentaries on the New Testament in which the prime objective would be a careful and thorough exegesis of the Greek texts. This was the style of Barrett's commentary. But by comparison C. S. C. Williams' commentary on the Acts of the Apostles has proved disappointing. That is not to say that this second book to appear in the series is lacking in scholarship. On the contrary, care has been used in presenting a new and lucid translation of the text, the divisions of which provide the sections into which the commentary is cast. Furthermore, one cannot read more than three pages of the commentary, to say nothing of the Introduction, without concluding that considerable study and research has gone into this production.

But Williams' approach to his book is not like that of Barrett in dealing with Romans. The text of the commentary, limited in the first place perhaps by publication considerations, is broken by constant parenthetical references to books and articles written on Acts by other scholars. Furthermore, such references not infrequently become a substitute for the writer's own comments on given verses or phrases.

Such a procedure affords the reader an idea of the scope of Williams' learning and reading on his subject, and is no doubt in accordance with his purpose to bring the scholarship of many men to bear upon Acts. But unhappily it makes the commentary largely unusable for the average student and pastor. One must have a library at his elbow in order to understand what Williams means to say. Only the erudite student of Acts will thus find this volume worth the price.

In matters of introduction Williams supports a theory that Luke first composed a first draft of his Gospel, then composed Acts after obtaining a copy of Mark, and finally revised his Gospel using Mark's chronology. The point is, in the author's view, that this leaves open the question whether in compiling material for Acts "Luke used other *written* sources besides Mark's Gospel rather than *oral* sources." The point is belabored.

Williams discusses thoroughly the questions involved in dating Acts, but arrives at no definite conclusion of his own. The same is true of his treatment of the purpose and conclusion of Acts, of the question of Luke's use of Josephus' "Antiquities," and of the problems of discrepancies between Acts and Paul's letters. One valuable section in the Introduction is the discussion of "The Speeches and the Theology of Acts." Without contributing much of his own that is new, the author introduces the reader to the debate that has raged about the subject for some years. General reaction: Too much anthology, not enough exegesis and commentary.

ROBERT A. BARTELS

*Tolkning av Nya Testamentet VIII. Galaterbrevet.* By Ragnar Bring. Stockholm: Svenska kyrkans diakonistyrelses bokförlag, 1958. 320 pages. 18 Kr. (paperback).

This is the third volume in the projected eleven volume series, under the editorship of Bishop Anders Nygren, which is intended to provide a comprehensive and scholarly commentary of the entire New Testament in the

vedish language. The first volume to ap-
ar was Bishop Nygren's *Commentary on*
*omans;* the second was Professor H. Ode-
rg's *Commentary on Corinthians.*

The series attempts a somewhat different
pe of biblical study, to be distinguished
om a primarily exegetical approach on the
e hand and from a popular, inspirational
proach on the other. Its aim is to investi-
te the thought content, the "message," the
tal theological perspective of the New
estament writings. This is, of course, in
mplete accord with the historical-sys-
matic approach which has characterized
arly all theological study in Sweden for
e last quarter of a century or more. It is
full accord with the general method of
notif-research," here specifically applied
the New Testament. This does not mean
at exegetical problems are ignored, since
e determination of the theological content
frequently dependent on the minutiae of
egetical inquiry. They are, however, sec-
dary in relation to the author's purpose.
The theme of Galatians may be stated as
hrist and the Law" (p. 5). It is, how-
er, not a theological treatise on the theme,
itten in the calm of undisturbed theo-
gical reflection. It is occasioned by a specific
storical situation; namely, the danger that
e Galatian Christians should be subverted
the "judaisers" who sought to make the
ospel an appendage of the whole system of
w-righteousness" which had become the
evailing element in the Jewish understand-
g of their Scriptures. This specific situ-
on governs the selection of materials used
Paul and is the key to understanding the
eological ideas which are expressed (p. 6).
One may also say that the theme of Gala-
ns is "Freedom and Bondage." But it is a
ecific kind of freedom—that which belongs
faith and the Spirit—and it is a specific
nd of bondage—that which is inherent in
w-righteousness" (p. 7). Paul wants to
ow the Galatians that the view of the
w which is espoused by the "judaisers"
a misrepresentation and perversion of the
d Testament Scriptures and the revelation
ich God has made of himself and his pur-
e therein. It is the attempt to use the
w by which man's failure and sinfulness
made explicit as a means of asserting one's
independence of God (p. 95), of justifying a claim upon God by virtue of his own deeds. This perversion, which has the appearance of a great show of respect for the Law, actually makes it trivial and insignificant. It does not reckon seriously with the Law. Paul, not the "judaisers," is the earnest exponent of the Law. It was the intention of the Law to make explicit to man that he was not giving God his due; to make clear that he was not righteous. The Law could not be fulfilled by a few legalistic observances. It could not be fulfilled by man at all. This realization is the death which Paul had experienced (p. 105). But now, in Christ, through the Gospel and the gift of the Spirit, the Law has been fulfilled. It is this fulfillment which excludes "law-righteousness" and makes both irreverent and obsolete all the efforts of the "judaisers."

This seems to be the major interpretative concept in Bring's analysis of Paul's position in Galatians. The Law has a fundamentally negative function; it is intended to make man aware of the hopeless state into which he has come. It is a true revelation of God's will. This is why man's failure is so serious. The Law achieves its purpose when man is brought to acknowledge his complete dependence upon God's grace. This is its positive contribution. But since in Christ the Law has been fulfilled, faith in Christ becomes the only proper and adequate reaction and response for one who would take God's Law seriously. If one substitutes legalistic observance, such as is implied in insisting on the rite of circumcision, for faith in Christ, one is refusing to acknowledge the truth of the Law or the authority of God and attempting to substitute for it the completely inadequate camouflage of self-righteousness.

Thus, Bring can identify the substance of Gal. 1:6-5:12 with the heading "In the Gospel, in which the Spirit is given, the Law is fulfilled but law-righteousness is excluded." In the accompanying exposition there are many and illuminating insights into specific arguments and ideas (e.g. the relation between "election" and "revelation," "faith and works" vs. "faith issuing in works," the issue between Paul and Peter, the two ages, etc.) but this is the core of Bring's analysis.

"For Paul faith and the true observance of the law (namely through Christ) belong together; they express the same fact" (p. 149).

It is of particular interest to this reviewer to note the prominence which is given to "forensic" elements in Paul's position. The emphasis upon Christ's fulfillment of the law, on Christ becoming a "curse," and similar ideas would dictate that the forensic way of talking about Christ's work would have to be taken into account. But one might have expected that a Lundensian would have felt called upon to relate this somewhat consciously to the dramatic "Christus Victor" interpretation to which such attention has been given by other members of this school. The only corresponding element in Bring's analysis which this reviewer can discover is the emphasis on faith as being an event, rather than "holding to be true" (försanthållandet) and the emphasis upon the Spirit. While these are surely not unique to a dramatic view, they do constitute a sort of bridge toward it. I missed, too, the genuinely dynamic view of justification which I found so illuminating years ago in his *Dualismen hos Luther*. Galatians 2:19, 20 would seem to have provided an opportunity to at least "graze" Karl Holl's interpretation of Luther's view of justification which seemed to be quite prominent in Bring's earlier works.

On the other hand, Swedish Theology has never denied the validity of the forensic framework in Paul's theology; it has only challenged the exclusiveness which that framework came to assume in much Christian history and the ignoring of other elements which are also biblical.

Bring's style is never simple or easy. He holds on to ideas until all of their ramifications have been explored, sometimes longer than seems necessary to the reader. But if one will stay with him he will surely be rewarded by much that a more popular exposition would miss.

These volumes could profitably be made available for a much larger audience than the Swedish language provides them.

EDGAR M. CARLSON

*Galilean Christianity*. By L. E. Elliott-Binns. Chicago: Alec R. Allenson, Inc., 1956. 80 pages. $1.50 (Studies in Biblical Theology, No. 16).

The study of the first few decades of the life of the Christian community in Palestine has engaged scholars for a long time. We are indebted to Professor Elliott-Binns for a new study which takes into account what has been done before (in this sense the little book is an excellent summary) and yet throughout is thoroughly independent.

His thesis is that there were two quite distinct groups in early Palestinian Christianity, one centering in Galilee and the other in Jerusalem. The Christian movement had its beginnings and first success (as the kerygma, Acts 10:37, and the Synoptic Gospels indicate) in Galilee. The prosperity, urbanization, and presence of non-Jewish elements in the population made Galilee quite different from Judaea. Its people were of a strongly independent spirit, not readily subservient to the ecclesiastical authority of Jerusalem, and open to new ideas. It is unlikely that the multitudes who were attracted by Jesus' Galilean ministry would dissipate at his death. In fact, there is evidence that there remained an active community of followers, distinct from both the Jewish Christianity of Jerusalem and the Gentile Christianity of St. Paul. This evidence is found in Mark, Q, some M material, the Fathers, and especially in the Epistle of James, which Elliott-Binns believes to be an early Galilean writing. The Galilean church was characterized by its emphasis on following the teachings of Jesus, a relatively undeveloped Christology, the absence of a doctrine of redemption, and a desire to maintain a close link with Judaism and the Old Testament.

The Jerusalem church under the leadership of James, the brother of our Lord but not the writer of the Epistle that bears his name, is reflected in Luke, Acts 1-12, and John 1-20. It was in the Jerusalem church that the theological implications of the life and death of Jesus were worked out. Elliott-Binns believes that the Jerusalem group first grew up around a small group of Galilean disciples. As the Judaizers and James gradually came to dominate the Jerusalem com-

unity, it also lost its spontaneous character nd assumed a more formal and ecclesi- stical organization.

The troubles in Palestine, which finally esulted in Rome's forcefully crushing Jewish esistance and capturing Jerusalem, com- elled the Christians to flee. The Galileans, ho did not go north to Antioch or Damas- us, fled eastward to Pella. The Jerusalem hristians fled there too. Here the two roups were drawn closer together. Mean- hile the death of James, the election of a ew leader in Jerusalem, and perhaps a de- re on the part of the Christians at Jeru- alem to belittle Galilee, together with the ore theological interpretation of the person nd work of Jesus popularized by Paul, re- ulted in the gradual eclipse of Galilean hristianity. As Christianity became more niversal in its composition and theology, ie various groups were either absorbed into ie broader stream or came to be identified ith such groups as the Ebionites and finally appeared within Islam.

A comparison of Elliott-Binns' study with ose of others who discuss the same question, it do not arrive at exactly the same con- usions, points up how much the final an- wer rests on the Epistle of James. If we ere able to determine clearly whether this pistle is late or early and, if early, whether is a product of the Jerusalem or the alilean community, there would be less ncertainty about the beliefs and char- cteristics of Palestinian Christianity.

HARRY J. MUMM

*ur Bible and the Ancient Manuscripts.* By Sir Frederic Kenyon. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1958. 352 pages. $6.95.

The introduction to the fourth edition of is standard work was initialled by the uthor in December, 1938. The present edi- on, copyrighted by the executors of his state, was revised by A. W. Adams, Dean f Divinity of Magdalen College, Oxford, ith an introduction offering an appreciative rvey of the career of Kenyon by the well- nown Prof. G. R. Driver.

Anyone familiar with earlier editions of is book will still feel at home with this evision. While the order is unchanged, a chapter has been added, "Revisions and Translations Since 1881," containing also a brief description of the new translation sponsored by the Established Churches of England and Scotland, the Free Churches of Great Britain, and other agencies. In addition, Appendix II, "Specimens of the English Translations of the Bible," has been augmented by the addition of four columns (Weymouth, Moffat, Knox, and RSV) and is happily so printed and bound that every column can be read. To the General Index, an Index of Biblical Passages has been added.

As useful as these additions are, the real need for revision is the flood of material which was not available to the original author. The reviser has made use of this new material in such a way that two extremes were avoided: the balanced structure of the book remains the same, and the additions were actually incorporated rather than tacked on. A comparison with the fourth edition shows that Chapter I, "Ancient Books and Writing," has been considerably expanded, with longer sections on the Dead Sea materials. In Chapter IV, "The Hebrew Old Testament," slight omissions of an apologetic nature were made, and the history of the Hebrew text was, understandably, rewritten. Chapter V, "The Ancient Versions of the Old Testament," was wisely restructured so that the discussion of the Targums does not precede that of the Septuagint. And it was inevitable that the section, "Condition of the Old Testament Text," would be redone.

Other chapters, of course, did not require such extensive revision. The whole manuscript was, however, submitted to a very minute scrutiny, for the attentive reader will be able to note minor modifications and changes. Historic justice, for instance, dictated the added reference to the manuscript classification proposed by von Soden, even though it was never widely adopted. Every reader familiar with earlier editions will have his list of changes which should have been made, but they will be of such a nature that their omission will not detract from the usefulness of this revision.

On the whole, this is a well executed revision of a time-tested standard work.

A. J. ENGELBRECHT

*A Beginner's Handbook to Biblical Hebrew.* By John H. Marks and Virgil M. Rogers. New York-Nashville: The Abingdon Press, 1958. xiv + 174 pages. $4.50.

Every new manual for teaching Hebrew is welcomed with the hope that it may provide a method of more readily introducing the student to his first (usually) Semitic language than those at present available. *The Beginner's Handbook* by Marks and Rogers attempts to meet this challenge. The inductive method, based on Genesis 1-22 is used—perhaps marking a full circle to the days of William Rainey Harper's inductive elementary grammars, which are not noted in the present work.

The first section of the *Handbook* consists of the usual introductory materials. One might note that the begadkepat letters are spirants after the vocal shewa as well as after a vowel (p. 5, n. 2). In a *Handbook* for beginners the introduction of the debatable *shewa medium* (p. 11) may be questioned. It would seem that if a shewa is "medium," it is also vocal *(shewa mobile)* or silent *(shewa quiescens)*, as the case may be. It should be thus treated as a part of the respective categories. It would appear that the term itself results from the fact that this particular usage did not conform to the rules set down by the grammarians for the shewa —hence the "neither fish nor fowl" category.

Part II deals with the article, conjunction, verbs, pronouns, nouns, etc. The discussion of nouns, usually early in this section, has been moved to a place just preceding the numerals—at the end of the section. Whether or not this is desirable probably depends chiefly on the preference of the individual instructor. For future study, the introduction of the student to the terms *qatl, qitl, qutl* (p. 80) is highly commendable. There is much useful information in paragraphs 60-68 not found in the treatment of nouns in the "standard" introductory grammars. Paragraph 59, helps in determining verb roots, would probably be worth the price of the book to many beginning students.

Part III discusses certain matters of syntax: use of the prepositions, infinitives, participles, etc. This useful section is not usually found in introductory grammars but the materials are incorporated in the discussion of the respective sections in Parts I and II

The book concludes with an excellent set of paradigms, exercises in verb recognition, a glossary of words and phrases in Genesis 1-22 (with references to the pertinent sections of the *Handbook)* and a timely section on the pronunciation and writing of modern Hebrew. A subject index at the end contributes to the value of the *Handbook* as a reference manual.

First varityped and then printed by photo-offset, the *Handbook* is easy to read. The begadkepat letters, when "spirantized," are marked with a line above or below the letter—a most desirable practice. The *shin* is noted as *š* rather than *sh*. Other signs and usages customarily used in Hebrew and Semitic reference grammars are employed—all to the advantage of the student as he progresses in his study.

As a classroom teaching instrument, the reviewer feels that the value (and probably cost) of the book would be appreciably increased by the inclusion of exercises illustrating the different items under discussion. The constant reference to the first chapters of Genesis makes the book especially useful to one learning Hebrew on his own, but it seems insufficient for classroom instruction. Because Hebrew is a language whose alphabet and vocalization as well as grammar entails extra effort on the part of the beginning student, these exercises would seem to be absolutely essential. Psychologically, the immediate use of the biblical text has great value but it does not replace, in the reviewer's opinion, a thorough grounding in Hebrew grammar and *then* confrontation of the text—*especially* if the student is planning advanced work in Hebrew or study of another Semitic language. The question also remains, "Is Genesis the best book for beginners in Hebrew to read?"

The *Handbook* is a highly simplified, up-dated version of the standard reference grammars (Gesenius-Kautzsch, Joüon, Bauer-Leander, *et al.)* with many items of immediate utility for the beginning student. Thus it will serve not only as an introductory Hebrew manual, but also as an important and useful supplement to other in-

ilged accordingly, much of Tillich's lan-
ıge would be suspect. Just what is the
:cise meaning of expressions such as the
ally real," "the eternal God-man-unity,"
ıe universal principle of divine self-mani-
ıtation," or "being as the power of con-
ering non-being," etc. It seems to me that
ıough Tillich asserts emphatically that
ology, based on revelation, must give the
swers which philosophy asks, it is in the
ll the philosophical, i.e., the philosophy,
ich shapes the answer.

Consider the following. "The divine tran-
ndence is identical with the freedom of the
ated to turn away from the essential unity
ith the creative ground of its being. Such
edom presupposes two qualities of the
ated: first, that it is substantially inde-
ndent of the divine ground; second, that
remains in substantial unity with it" (p. 8),
d "God is infinite, in so far as he is the
eative ground of the finite and eternally
oduces the finite potentialities in himself.
he finite does not limit him but belongs to
e eternal processes of his life" (p. 91),
d ". . . God is eternally creative, that
rough himself he creates the world and
rough the world himself" (p. 147). Such
atements not only raise all kinds of semantic
fficulties but they seem to me to indicate
at Schelling's idealistic philosophy is more
cisive in the end than the biblical distinc-
on between creator and creature and Lu-
er's distinction between the "deus absconi-
tus" and the "deus revelatus." It seems to
e that the trouble, therefore, lies in the
sfusal to admit the absoluteness of the
radoxes which go counter to the reason
id of which man can understand only that
e does not understand them. This, then, is
so the decisive point with respect to the
hristology.

I do not want to belittle how very much
here is which should be listened to, especially
h Tillich's analysis of existence (based
rimarily upon Kierkegaard) and his criti-
ism of traditional views. Here he shows his
ast erudition and tremendous grasp of the
ssues which dwarf the ordinary mortal's
erceptions. Yet the crux in his theology
eems to me to be at the point of not allow-
ng the full mystery of the Incarnation. To
he one side of this paradox he does full
justice. "The paradox of the Christian mes-
sage is that in *one* personal life essential
manhood has appeared under the conditions
of existence without being conquered by
them" (p. 94). This says to me that in a
genuine human being, tempted like as we are,
we see the one in whom God's will is done.
He is the second Adam who begins a new
humanity. But what now of the other side
of the paradox, which justifies falling down
before him with the cry, "My Lord and my
God?" What of Christian piety through the
years which has looked to him as fully God,
prayed to him, worshipped him, as Redeemer,
Atoner, Judge?

Tillich rejects any notion of a Mediator
who stands midway between God and man.
"The Mediator is not a half-God. This was
the first great anti-heretical decision of
Christianity, viz., that he is not a third
reality between God and man" (p. 169).
Then he also rejects "the metamorphosis of
a divine being into the man Jesus of Naza-
reth" (p. 112). Such a pagan metamorphosis
is not the mystery of the Incarnation. Rightly
so, but then neither is it that "In Christ the
eternal God-man-unity has appeared under
the conditions of existence" (p. 169). Nor
is it that, "The universal principle of divine
self-manifestation is in its essential char-
acter qualitatively present in an individual
human being. . . . Participation in the uni-
versal Logos is dependent on participation
in the Logos actualized in a historical per-
sonality" (p. 112). This does not seem to
me to be at all what Paul meant when he
said, "God was in Christ, reconciling the
world unto himself." Here I think it becomes
apparent how philosophy runs away with
theology. What does a "universal principle
of divine self-manifestation" have to do with
the living God of the Bible or with the
Logos conceived of as the God who speaks
and in his speaking acts? No one can pray
to or get much help from such a principle.

I would agree that the classical Chalce-
donian Christology needs reformulation. As
it stands, it can only be subscribed in its
historical context as a safeguard against cer-
tain heresies. I would agree also that the
reformulation should be in functional terms.
God is what he does and Jesus as the Christ
also is what he does. The distinction between

naturalized and the question of meaning in history was abandoned.

Then he takes up the question of man in history and shows that man's view of history is always determined by how he regards himself. There is, therefore, no objective description of the course of historical events. It is always a certain self-understanding which shapes man's interpretation of history. This leads Bultmann then in the concluding chapter (X: Christian Faith and History) to give the existentialist interpretation of history and eschatology. Since man stands within history and shapes it by his own decisions he can never get a view of the whole of history. Man's historicity consists precisely in the fact that he is burdened by the past and must by his decision in the present shape his future. So he is shaped by and himself shapes history. This is one facet of the Christian understanding of man as historical. To this must be added the other facet: "Christian faith believes that man does not have the freedom which is presupposed for historical decisions. In fact, I am always determined by my own past by which I have become what I am and of which I cannot get rid, of which in the last resort I am unwilling to be rid, although unconsciously" (p. 150). It is only in the encounter with Jesus as the Christ that man attains to freedom from the past and openness for the future, for here he finds forgiveness and a new self and freedom to act in love. "For in the decision of faith I do not decide on a responsible action, but on a new understanding of myself as free from myself by the grace of God and as endowed with my new self, and this is at the same time the decision to accept a new life grounded in the grace of God. In making this decision I also decide on a new understanding of my responsible acting. This does not mean that the responsible decision demanded by the historical moment is taken away from me by faith, but it does mean that all responsible decisions are born of love. For love consists in unreservedly being for one's neighbor, and this is possible only for the man who has become free from himself" (p. 152). The one who is free in this way has arrived at true eschatological existence.

The conclusion therefore is: ". . . the meaning in history lies always in the present, and when the present is conceived as the eschatological present by Christian faith the meaning in history is realized. Man who complains, 'I cannot see meaning in history, and therefore my life, interwoven in history, is meaningless,' is to be admonished: do not look around yourself into universal history, you must look into your own personal history. Always in your present lies the meaning in history, and you cannot see it as a spectator, but only in your responsible decisions. In every moment slumbers the possibility of being the eschatological moment. You must awaken it" (p. 155).

This book should do a great deal to help clarify Bultmann's views. To that end it is highly recommended.

MARTIN J. HEINECKEN

*Systematic Theology. Volume II: Existence and The Christ.* By Paul Tillich. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1957. 187 pages. $4.50.

Since this review is belated it is intended as a critical appraisal rather than as a review of the content. When the first volume had appeared many said we must wait for the Christology before we can make any judgment about whether or not Tillich's restatement of the Christian faith really preserves the essential Christian content. Those who refuse to allow the legitimacy of historical criticism and who misunderstand Tillich's use of religious symbolism will be quick in their condemnation. His designation of much of the biblical material as legendary and mythical is enough to put him outside the pale.

My criticism, however, will take a different turn, since I would allow the necessity of honest historical criticism and also, as Tillich suggests, the "deliteralization" rather than demythologization of the biblical myths. What I would question is rather the endeavor of a philosophical theology to bring the biblical language into some kind of rapport with that of the philosophers. It seems to me that present day analytical philosophers are correct in saying that the task of the philosopher is the very humble but essential one of the analysis of meaning.

idged accordingly, much of Tillich's lan-
iage would be suspect. Just what is the
ecise meaning of expressions such as the
eally real," "the eternal God-man-unity,"
he universal principle of divine self-mani-
station," or "being as the power of con-
iering non-being," etc. It seems to me that
though Tillich asserts emphatically that
eology, based on revelation, must give the
iswers which philosophy asks, it is in the
d the philosophical, i.e., the philosophy,
hich shapes the answer.

Consider the following. "The divine tran-
endence is identical with the freedom of the
eated to turn away from the essential unity
ith the creative ground of its being. Such
eedom presupposes two qualities of the
eated: first, that it is substantially inde-
ndent of the divine ground; second, that
remains in substantial unity with it" (p. 8),
d "God is infinite, in so far as he is the
eative ground of the finite and eternally
oduces the finite potentialities in himself.
he finite does not limit him but belongs to
e eternal processes of his life" (p. 91),
d ". . . God is eternally creative, that
rough himself he creates the world and
rough the world himself" (p. 147). Such
atements not only raise all kinds of semantic
fficulties but they seem to me to indicate
at Schelling's idealistic philosophy is more
cisive in the end than the biblical distinc-
on between creator and creature and Lu-
er's distinction between the "deus absconi-
tus" and the "deus revelatus." It seems to
e that the trouble, therefore, lies in the
fusal to admit the absoluteness of the
radoxes which go counter to the reason
d of which man can understand only that
e does not understand them. This, then, is
so the decisive point with respect to the
hristology.

I do not want to belittle how very much
ere is which should be listened to, especially
Tillich's analysis of existence (based
imarily upon Kierkegaard) and his criti-
sm of traditional views. Here he shows his
st erudition and tremendous grasp of the
sues which dwarf the ordinary mortal's
rceptions. Yet the crux in his theology
ems to me to be at the point of not allow-
g the full mystery of the Incarnation. To
e one side of this paradox he does full
justice. "The paradox of the Christian mes-
sage is that in *one* personal life essential
manhood has appeared under the conditions
of existence without being conquered by
them" (p. 94). This says to me that in a
genuine human being, tempted like as we are,
we see the one in whom God's will is done.
He is the second Adam who begins a new
humanity. But what now of the other side
of the paradox, which justifies falling down
before him with the cry, "My Lord and my
God?" What of Christian piety through the
years which has looked to him as fully God,
prayed to him, worshipped him, as Redeemer,
Atoner, Judge?

Tillich rejects any notion of a Mediator
who stands midway between God and man.
"The Mediator is not a half-God. This was
the first great anti-heretical decision of
Christianity, viz., that he is not a third
reality between God and man" (p. 169).
Then he also rejects "the metamorphosis of
a divine being into the man Jesus of Naza-
reth" (p. 112). Such a pagan metamorphosis
is not the mystery of the Incarnation. Rightly
so, but then neither is it that "In Christ the
eternal God-man-unity has appeared under
the conditions of existence" (p. 169). Nor
is it that, "The universal principle of divine
self-manifestation is in its essential char-
acter qualitatively present in an individual
human being. . . . Participation in the uni-
versal Logos is dependent on participation
in the Logos actualized in a historical per-
sonality" (p. 112). This does not seem to
me to be at all what Paul meant when he
said, "God was in Christ, reconciling the
world unto himself." Here I think it becomes
apparent how philosophy runs away with
theology. What does a "universal principle
of divine self-manifestation" have to do with
the living God of the Bible or with the
Logos conceived of as the God who speaks
and in his speaking acts? No one can pray
to or get much help from such a principle.

I would agree that the classical Chalce-
donian Christology needs reformulation. As
it stands, it can only be subscribed in its
historical context as a safeguard against cer-
tain heresies. I would agree also that the
reformulation should be in functional terms.
God is what he does and Jesus as the Christ
also is what he does. The distinction between

the person and the work of Christ cannot be maintained. Therefore, what matters is what Jesus as the Christ is to the believer, as both true man and true God. If it is constantly reiterated that no one was ever able to make himself believe such an absurdity, then this is quite correct, as many believers have again and again testified (Tertullian, Luther, Kierkegaard). What they did do, however, is find the gracious God Himself in the man Jesus as Lord. And this experience defied what their reason told them was an impossibility. I, for one, therefore, will go along with Luther and Kierkegaard. The attempt to build the bridge between philosophy and theology only results in a circumlocution that may appease the "cultured despisers of religion" but hardly does justice to what has through the years caused men to fall to their knees with the cry, "My Lord and my God." In saying this I do not deny the validity of Tillich's method of correlation, but would only plead that theology and not philosophy really give the answers.

*Luther's World of Thought.* By Heinrich Bornkamm. St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1958. 303 pages. $3.00.

Sometimes reviews of translated works acknowledge the translator in the final sentence with a sort of perfunctory gesture. Even when the translation is not first rate, this seems like a left-handed way of recognizing what is, after all, a great contribution, assuming, that is, that the book is worth translating.

In the instance at hand we wish to reverse the practice and say a hearty thank you to Martin Bertram, first, for a good translation, and, second, for translating a book that deserves wide readership.

Heinrich Bornkamm, the well-known professor of church history at Heidelberg University, has brought together fifteen occasional essays on Luther. That which ties the book together is not merely its pivotal character but the fact that the author is concerned with Luther's intellectual world *(Luther's geistige Welt* is the German title of the book). "Luther was more than a great theologian," says Bornkamm. "He was a man of wide and varied interests and a thinker whose mind encompassed many fields. Therefore it may be permissible to present his world of thought, not in a compact theological system but in a free and easy choice of some of the most significant themes" (p. vii).

After a succinct biographical treatment in the opening essay Bornkamm shows how Luther's basic views permeated his understanding of the world about him. His world included not only the church, but nature, history, society, politics, and language. Each of these areas, argues Bornkamm, is illuminated by Luther's own theological insights and religious experience. In fact, when one understands Luther's point of view it seems almost un-Lutheran to speak of "non-theological factors" as influencing the life and growth of God's people in the world.

It is difficult to imagine how anyone with an interest in Luther would find this work anything but absorbing. The product of careful scholarship, the book is nevertheless free of the formidable scholarly apparatus which so often frightens the lay reader. In fact, the author's style is almost "popular" as he leads the reader easily into the profundity of Luther's thought. For example, Bornkamm alludes to, among other things in the essay "The Hidden and the Revealed God," the problem of the Word of God and Scripture. Luther, he says, called Christ the Word of God. Even though he does not equate and thus confuse the Word of God and Scripture, Luther by no means devalues Scripture. Rather, this insight serves only to enhance the Bible: ". . . the more firmly we fix our gaze on Christ and the more candidly and freely we search for His footprints in the Bible, the better will we understand this Book" (p. 72).

When Bornkamm discusses Luther on the sacraments there are similarly helpful utterances. He points out that Luther refers to the sacraments as "signs," but certainly not in a spiritualistic, Zwinglian sense. "Luther did not use the word 'sign' *(Zeichen)* in the sense of symbols. . . . Mere signs, signs in the sense of symbols . . . always refer to an absent object. The sign [Luther] had in mind is an effective one. Whatever it represents actually happens. Baptism and Holy Communion do not only speak of for-

ness of sin; they also contain and effect (p. 97).

wo subjects which are currently engag- the best theological minds in Christen- are the problems of nature and history. nkamm's discussion of the former ("The ure of Nature") admits that Luther was natural scientist, but his understanding God and the infiniteness of the world es it possible (as it was impossible under hodoxy's attempt to reconcile the Bible Aristotle's physics) to trace a path to modern conception of nature. "His views nature are not the measure of his scien- knowledge; but they are, intrinsically, reflex of his religion" (p. 187). Luther's s on history ("God and History") are sumed by Bornkamm under three factors t shape history: the nation, the law, and great men. In each it is the activity of l which is meaningful. "God speaks to not through words but through acts— t is the meaning of history" (p. 215).

One could go on, culling phrase after ase; the book is copiously supplied with notable quotes." But the best favor we render is to urge the purchase of this ok so that the quotes can be read in their ll argued and fluently written context.

E. Clifford Nelson

*w Light on Martin Luther With An Authentic Account of the Luther Film of 1953.* By Albert Hyma. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1958.

Dr. Albert Hyma is professor of history the University of Michigan. His historical erests have centered largely on the late iddle Ages, Renaissance, and Reformation. ecial attention has been paid to the re- ious movement known as the *Devotio oderna* in which the Brethren of the Com- on Life played the main role. In addition, rofessor Hyma served on the editorial aff for the 1955 extension of *The New haff-Herzog Encyclopedia, The Twentieth entury Encyclopedia of Religious Knowl- ge.* He had responsibility for Medieval d Reformation church history.

In the present work Dr. Hyma promises ore than he delivers. The anticipation engendered by the title rather quickly gives way to disappointment. He concentrates his attention on what he calls the "neglected years" in Luther biography, that is, 1483-1505 and 1525-1546, and here he proposes to provide "new light" on Luther. Interlarded in his writing are critical attacks on the Luther film of 1953 and Professor Bainton's biography of Luther, *Here I Stand.* There may be vulnerable points in both of these productions, but neither of them will fall into disrepute because of Hyma's "new light."

Here and there scattered throughout the book are interesting and, in some instances, new (at least to this reviewer) bits of information. Piled together they might make quite a heap, but they can hardly be called the basis for a "new" understanding of Luther. There is one point, at least, where Hyma is to be severely criticized. I refer to his attempt to make a serious study of Luther with a rather limited and superficial appreciation of the theology of Luther. One example suffices: on page 6 he refers to the Marburg Colloquy in these words, "They refused to sit at the communion table together, because they detested those with whom they disagreed on a rather insignificant doctrinal matter." One does not have to be a Lutherophile to experience revulsion at this kind of interpretation.

Along with this there is another criticism: the writer's style. Even in his good books, such as *Brethren of the Common Life,* the style is tedious, rambling, and discursive. The same is true of this *New Light.* . . .

Careful students of Luther will have difficulty giving serious attention to this book.

E. Clifford Nelson

*Late Medieval Mysticism.* Edited by Ray C. Petry. [The Library of Christian Classics, Volume XIII.] Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1957. 424 pages. $5.00.

Professor Petry, at Duke University for two decades, is a well-known medievalist who has brought his impressive scholarship to bear on the fashioning of this book. The result is a worthy companion to other volumes in *The Library of Christian Classics.*

In a judicious collection of translations the

editor has set forth representative selections from thirteen mystical traditions dating from the twelfth through the fifteenth centuries. Included are portions, usually from twenty to thirty pages, drawn from the following: Bernard of Clairvaux; the Victorines—Hugh, Richard, and Adam; Francis of Assisi; Bonaventure; Ramon Lull; Meister Eckhart; Richard Rolle; Henry Suso; Catherine of Siena; Jan Van Ruysbroeck; Theologia Germanica; Nicholas of Cusa; and Catherine of Genoa. The result is a good cross-sectional picture of the contemplative tendencies of the period.

A general introduction of more than thirty pages sets the material in the ongoing history of western mysticism and delineates its character helpfully. Each author is introduced with a compact biographical notice, a short but scholarly bibliographical essay, and an instructive synopsis of the author's main ideas and emphases, expressed in a too-packed Petry prose. The volume is well indexed, including an index of biblical references.

The anthology bears out the editor's claim that these contemplatives usually insisted upon the necessity of balancing contemplation with action in response to human need in God's name. While mysticism is centrally conceived to be the moment of immediate access to divine reality, emphasis is also placed in these works upon self-renunciation and asceticism as necessary preparation for such mystic union. Normative is the threefold way of purification, illumination, and union.

Readers of *The Lutheran Quarterly* will probably profit from reading this volume. Lutherans often need to realize more fully the broad scope of Christian experience. In our efforts to delineate what is theologically correct we may too readily reject what is nonetheless genuine Christian piety. Usually Lutherans also need a better appreciation of the much-neglected, much-maligned medieval period.

Certainly these writers lived in a world remote from most modern Lutheran thought and experience. The reader must exercise patience in the presence of detailed allegories and the involved gradations and hierarchies found in the interior life by these mystics. Sometimes he will wish to cut short the argument with the cry of "sola gratia," since God's grace and human aspiration blend intricately here.

Actually the technical language and detailed introspection are no greater than that of modern psychology. The thought-world is simply quite different. Lacking is the empirical note which helps to make Augustine and Bonhoeffer more appealing for modern readers.

All the more reason to recommend this volume for reading and use in fulfilling the purpose of the whole *Library of Christian Classics,* namely, to repossess some of the incomparable treasures of Christian history for this generation.

FREDERICK K. WENTZ

*Six Makers of English Religion.* By Gordon Rupp. New York: Harper and Brothers.

Gordon Rupp, professor of ecclesiastical history at the University of Manchester, England, is well-known to American churchmen as a sparkling lecturer and as a writer of theological and historical works which are both solid and entertaining. Lutherans have appreciated his studies in Luther's life and thought. This present book is a small one and easily read, but the graceful style cannot conceal the thorough research, sound judgment, and human insight which characterize all of Rupp's books.

By "English Religion" Rupp means the "English Protestant tradition," but he is quite consciously speaking from a broader platform than those who would draw a sharp line between the Establishment and the Nonconformist families. He argues that a way of life was created in England by the Reformation, and that it contained a way of faith which was different from the medieval religion which preceded it and from the pieties of Continental Protestantism and post-Tridentine Rome. In the making of this "English Religion" there are certain landmarks, certain great normative documents. Among these were the *English Bible,* the *Book of Common Prayer,* and in a lesser way Foxe's *Book of Martyrs, Paradise Lost, Pilgrim's Progress,* and the hymns of Isaac Watts. All were writings which influenced many millions

f readers. All had behind them the creative nergy of genius. Three of them belong to ne Establishment and three to the Nononformist pedigree, but they have affected ne temper of all English communions. Rupp ffers this series of essays in the hope that eaders will be encouraged to read these reat documents for themselves. He warns he reader that he has written these pages less as technical studies than as edifying iscourses."

In telling the story of "William Tyndale nd the English Bible" Rupp refers to the nany familiar items involved in the making f the King James version. But he lays chief tress on the personal character of Tyndale, n the difficulties he faced, the influence of uther and of Wittenberg upon him, and he particular features of his genius as a ranslator. Rupp is especially concerned to oint out that Tyndale had to fight against cclesiastical authorities who refused to face he theological challenge of the "open Bible."

Thomas Cranmer's character and career re sketched in a profoundly moving way. His martyrdom makes as deep an impression n one as does his prodigious liturgical achievement. Rupp shows convincingly that John Foxe's *Book of Martyrs* turned the Marian persecution into the greatest single act of propaganda in history. It led Englishnen to determine that coercion should be no part of religion. Beyond this, Foxe's book evoked the militant character of the church and the life-and-death character of the Christian vocation.

An excellent treatment of the meaning of Puritanism is set forth in the chapter on John Milton. Rupp develops the Christian rationale of toleration in discussing the *Areopagitica.* His commentary on *Paradise Lost* is splendid, although brief. The short chapter on Bunyan shows how the thought and spirit of a great and devoted man are embodied in a classic writing. *Pilgrim's Progrss* still speaks to twentieth-century man who moves wonderingly along the road of human experience and to the church which once again has the vocation of mapmaking. The chapter on Isaaac Watts shows how this greatest of all English hymnwriters saved the worship of Nonconformity from rationalism.

These essays are indeed "edifying discourses." The reader sees in a new way how much one man can do and what great gifts the Lord of the Church can devise for our blessing, despite the sins of Christian men and the failings of the Church.

HAROLD H. DITMANSON

*Efterföljelsens teologi hos Sören Kierkegaard.* By Valter Lindström. Stockholm: Diakonistyrelsens Bokförlag, 1956.

Lindström's book is really the second in a series. The first *(Stadiernas teologi,* 1943) argued the importance and validity of "the theology of the stages" to Kierkegaardian literature; this volume discerns and states "an imitation of Christ theology" and uses it to delineate the second half of that same literature. The book is important to Kierkegaard scholars because it makes a thesis, develops it bountifully, and discusses it up and down. Undoubtedly the book is important to Lindström, too, as a kind of polemical piece. Like so much scholarly work of northern Europe, this one is written with and against secondary sources and authorities. Thus, for better or for worse, Bohlin, Geismar, Lögstrup, Lønning, Hirsch, and others are devastated, and Lindström remains at the top of the heap. Whatever ethical maxims describe scholars in action, they surely seem not to be derived from imitating Christ.

Lindström's book is, nonetheless, one of the most substantial of recent years on Kierkegaard. It deserves translation into English, if for no other reason than that it is the work of such an ample theological connoisseur. Not every Swede is a Lundensian, nor is every Scandinavian a parochial Lutheran. Lindström is urbane about intellectual matters, skillful in using evidence and constructing an argument, adept and fluent in the Swedish language, and, above all, knowledgeable concerning theology and Kierkegaard. The book is, therefore, a real treat from cover to cover.

Taking themes from Kierkegaard's literature, Lindström develops very painstakingly his hypothesis about the importance and scope of the "imitation" motif. A series of paired opposites—rejected yet lifted up,

Atoning One yet paradigm, historical yet contemporary Christ, self-denial yet ego-salvatory, the solitary individual yet the fellowship, faith yet works—these and more provide the frame for the discussion. Lindström, who is a professor-clergyman of the Swedish Lutheran Church, finds many reasons for bringing up most of the criticisms conceived by Lutherans and others of typical emphases of Kierkegaard. He establishes that Kierkegaard took theology seriously; that subjectivity did not substitute for the "what," the content, of belief; that Kierkegaard was not an idealist or docetist; that he believed in the resurrection (pp. 34 ff.); that he was not heterodox (p. 55); that he took Communion seriously (p. 89); that he cannot be explained psychologically (pp. 151 ff.); that his individualism was not sectarian; that he was not opposed to the Atonement; etc., etc.

Despite all of this, which in this telling may seem like ecclesiastical whitewash, Lindström does not make Kierkegaard into another safe and uninteresting professor. The discernment, the exactness, the fervor of Kierkegaard's thought cannot be kept out. Besides, Lindström seems to be as sure as anyone can be that Kierkegaard is right and that the New Testament and faithful followers are on this side too. Following Jesus is not hyperbolic talk, and this Kierkegaard and Lindström know. So, throughout the book, the richly timbred pathos of Kierkegaard's religious writings keeps arising as a kind of goad to follow Jesus rather than simply rooting for him from the pulpit and pew. One wishes a little that Lindström would let that suffice, but he has some anxieties to settle with his scholarly brethren. These do not, however, detract as much as one might think, and, besides, what is scholarship for if not for such flourishes as these?

The book ends with a few editorial remarks about further problems. I cannot believe that an author as intelligent as Valter Lindström can take seriously the psychological ruminations which he offers about how Kierkegaard conceived the effects of following Jesus, nor can I believe that the cleft between the two halves of Kierkegaard's authorship is so significant as to be "one of the most important—and difficult . . . ." worthy of future Kierkegaardian research. I am certain that Lindström has forgotten that Kierkegaard believed that human subjectivity was precisely the arena of synthesis, where discrepant factors could be put together or from which they could be excluded as the case might be. By stressing the linguistic formulations of various issues and remembering their contrarieties, Lindström creates bigger problems for Kierkegaard than S. K. would ever have to admit.

All in all, however, this is a most rewarding book. It perhaps does not detract from its merits to insist that its virtues are that it makes Kierkegaard's emphasis very clear. When Lindström insists that there are difficulties, I can only concur. I believe he is mistaken in assuming that such difficulties as there are (e.g., in the faith-works issue) require a correction of theology. Kierkegaard must surely be right, viz., in insisting that many of these problems are not strictly speaking resolvable in the theological medium in which they are raised. It is for this reason that he pointed out that the genuineness of our existence did not depend upon the genuineness of our theology, but that the genuineness of our existence did depend upon the genuineness of our faith and obedience. Here, he was confident, a resolution was possible, even if theology could only speak paradoxically and haltingly about these matters.

PAUL L. HOLMER

*Alte Briefe aus Indien. Unveröffentlichte Briefe von Bartholomäus Ziegenbalg, 1706-1719.* Edited by Arno Lehmann. Berlin: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 1957. 552 pages. DM 28.

Reproduced here is a large collection of hitherto unpublished letters by the first Lutheran missionary sent to India from Halle. Framed in the fulsome language of the time, the letters disclose many parallels to the letters written by Halle missionaries in North America during the eighteenth century: the laborious production of literature in a new tongue (including a hymnal with Tamil melodies), the frustrating lack of funds and personnel, the use of Halle medicines and books, the proposal to train and ordain native ministers, the inability of European patrons to

preciate such needs. Even Ziegenbalg's ored reasons to account for his decision marry parallel those sent to Halle a few ars later by H. M. Muhlenberg. (Incitally, if Ziegenbalg's letter proposing rriage to a girl in Germany were placed ngside C. F. W. Walther's letter of prosal, one would have an interesting study contrasts not only between the two men t also between the piety of the eighteenth d the piety of the nineteenth centuries.)

These reflections of the reviewer are not ended to divert attention away from the rly history of Lutheran missionary activity India (to which the collection is an obus contribution) but to suggest that the tters are also absorbing as human documnts. Not only the historian but the general ader, too, will be grateful to the professor Missions in the University of Halle, who also the author of a recent biography of rtholomew Ziegenbalg for gathering these imate glimpses into the life of a man and the church in an age quite different from r own.

THEODORE G. TAPPERT

*xte zur Geschichte des Pfarrernotbundes.* Wilhelm Niemöller, ed. Berlin: De Gruyter (Kleine Texte Nr. 180), 1958. 110 pages. DM 8.80.

With significant documentation of the mili-nt role played by Martin Niemöller and the Pfarrernotbund" in resisting theological and nfessional tyranny this book is an impresve addition to the ever-growing list of udies concerning church-state relations in e Third Reich.

Existing since 1933, the Bund once (1934) umbered some 7,000 members. It is curious at in spite of harassment and persecution ome members were martyred) the Bund as never extirpated nor indeed even banned. emarkable, too, is the fact that a subantial body of pertinent documents survived nfiscation and destruction.

The introductory analysis and ninety-one ges of documents offer proof that the Bund urageously and consistently continued to romulgate the word of God and the creed of the Reformation in word, spirit, and deed for both pastor and congregant.

WAYNE WONDERLEY

*A Year With the Bible.* By John Marsh. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1957. 191 pages. $2.50.

It is refreshing to study a book of daily Bible readings in which the Bible is given a chance to speak. Professor Marsh does not try to grind his ax in answer to the question, What is the Bible? Although his selection of passages and his interpretative daily commentaries imply answers to this question, his main thesis in these readings "is meant to provide a sufficient selection from the Scriptures to enable us to see for ourselves what the meaning of our life is, and in what a tremendous context it has been set." Thus in answer to contemporary views of the meaningless nature of life, the author clearly suggests that life finds meaning only in the context of the biblical story.

The daily readings are divided into nine main sections. The first thirteen selections are chosen from Gen. 1-11. The second and largest part contains 208 readings from the Old Testament as a history of the people of God. The third part outlines Old Testament worship, and the fourth part interprets the wisdom literature.

Part five (24 readings) contains selections from the Gospels on the birth, life, death, resurrection, and ascension of Jesus. The sixth section tells of Paul's mission work, and the seventh part reflects on the life of the primitive churches. Part eight includes eschatological selections.

The last section suggests responses of the Christian to the center of the biblical message, "that the infinite God has 'stooped to ask of me the love of my poor heart.' Therein lies the true glory and dignity of man, if he will but embrace it."

These daily commentaries are rather spotty and uneven in their provocativeness. In part four, an Old Testament section, some readings have only a helpful title, whereas readings on the life of Christ are often illuminated with more than a page of stimulating analyses.

This book will not please the reader who

prefers the hortatory type of daily devotional reading. The author has chosen to avoid that type of specific applications. The Bible student who prefers to read and then be challenged to make his own personal applications will find this book helpful.

ROBERT W. LARSEN

*Old Testament Portraits.* By Kendrick Strong. Philadelphia: Christian Education Press, 1958. x +179 pages. $3.50.

This is a series of Old Testament character studies with application to present day situations and circumstances. Thirteen of the less frequently treated personalities form the basis of the several chapters of the book and they are handled in a most interesting and captivating way. The author has the happy faculty of combining a keen sense of understanding with a marked facility of description that permits the reader to enjoy a ringside seat in the great panorama of life and activity in which each character lived and moved.

What makes the book notable is the fact that it draws eternal lessons from that portion of the great treasure house of God's word which has been so long neglected by so many heralds of the Gospel. The author has discovered its pertinence for today and says rather pointedly, "To me, the Old Testament has a rare life and vigor that cannot be concealed by the encrustment of age. It is rooted in antiquity, truly enough, and its framework is indubitably historical; but it speaks insistently to the problems of our own day." His six convictions about the Old Testament are sound and upon the basis of those convictions he proceeds to deal with his chosen personalities: Adam and Eve, Noah, Abraham, Jacob, Joseph, Balaam, Gideon, Jephthah, Sampson, Elijah, Micaiah, Naaman and Jonah.

Dr. Strong is an excellent modern example of the scribe whom Jesus likens to "a householder who brings out of his treasure what is new and what is old" (Mt. 13:52) and whose dexterity and skill ought to be cultivated by every expositor of the divine revelation for the needs of the time. He is pastor of the Brooklyn Heights Congregational Church, Cleveland, Ohio. He has been a leader of student work in his denomination. The art work of the book, which is superb and instructive, has been contributed by Harold Minton of Philadelphia.

J. M. MYERS

*The Way of the Cross in Human Relations.* By Guy Franklin Hershberger. Scottdale, Pa.: Herald Press, 1958. 424 pages. $5.50.

The scientific and political developments during the last decade have focused attention on the problem of war and violence in a new way. The question arises whether the preservation of the human race does not demand that we renounce war and adopt an attitude of non-resistance and pacificism. This situation has turned our attention to those sects and movements which have traditionally taken the pacifist position. In the time of the Reformation the Anabaptists represented this position, and such groups as the Mennonites and the Friends have perpetuated their witness. Several books have appeared lately restating the principles of these churches and insisting that this is the only way by which the future of humanity can be secured. Dietrich Bonhoeffer was one of the great advocates of the way of "costly grace" during the last war, and this book also presents "the way of the cross in human relations."

The book contains the following divisions. (1) "Foundations," in which Dr. Hershberger sets forth the biblical message of the way of the cross in obedience to the law of Christ. (2) "The Way of the Cross in Christendom," which the author presents as really a repudiation of the real way of the cross by the Christians from the medieval church down to the advocates of the social gospel and social action represented by Niebuhr, Bennett, et al. (3) "The Anabaptists," who have maintained faithfully the witness of the way of the cross down to the present time. (4) "The way of the cross in economic life." (5) "The way of the cross in social relations." (6) "Consummation."

The way of the cross is a faithful following in the footsteps of Christ, not resisting evil, turning the other cheek, and giving oneself in obedient service to the neighbor. Dr.

ershberger presents this point of view ith eloquent persuasiveness and firm conction. He makes the choice between "cheap" race and "costly" grace seem inevitable. he way of the cross is not an easy way, id the Christian's task is difficult and enils suffering.

Yet in spite of the apparent consistency id simplicity the argument fails to convince. here are certain elements omitted which ight change the situation. The Old Testaent is not given serious consideration. We elieve that the whole Bible, the Old and e New Testaments, is the Word of God. he Old Testament is not superseded; it mains a part of the Bible and must be ken into consideration when we try to certain the will of God. The result of this glect is that the Bible becomes a source teaching, not a record of God's acts in story. One of the author's main contenons is that God does not require a Christian o serve as an agency of the divine wrath" p. 20). The Christian serves the redemptive urpose of God, but if God wants to carry ut his judgments on sin, he has to use nners and unbelievers. Such a position can e taken only by ignoring the Old Testament. God is working in history, then the Chrisan, too, must participate in the affairs of is world, even though by so doing he beomes guilty. Of course, every one must gree to *some* degree of participation; it is nly a question of keeping it down to a inimum.

Although it is as impossible for a Lutheran day, as in the time of the Reformation, to ccept this Anabaptist position, we must ecognize the sincere social concern and the nswerving loyalty to Christ of the people r whom the author speaks. Theirs is a al and effective witness against violence id war, and a reminder to all Christians at the world was not and can not be saved "cheap" grace.

E. H. Wahlstrom

*ove, Skill and Mystery.* By Theodor Bovet. Garden City, N. Y.: Doubleday & Co., Inc., 1958. 188 pages. $3.50.

Here is a "Handbook to Marriage" that ill be welcomed by the Christian reader as a refreshing addition to the fast growing list of titles on sex and marriage counseling. Protestant pastors and other marriage counselors will find in it the kind of treatment that puts a firm Christian base and a high toned spirit into a subject that is still seeking a proper perspective and manner of expression. They cannot afford to neglect a careful reading of this work. Of the many books to be put into the hands of the married or the about-to-be-married couple, this is unquestionably one of the more desirable. In the minds of many, no doubt, it will be considered to be the best.

One appreciates Dr. Bovet's balanced presentation. Marriage is a total association lasting for life, he says. It is neither purely economic, nor psychological, nor sexual. It is all of these, and more. It is a living branch of the whole great tree of humanity. It is like a growing organism. It is altogether under God and of God. Dr. Bovet leaves no doubt that he refers to the God who has spoken through the Holy Scriptures, and who has made himself known through our Lord Jesus Christ. In this the good doctor, a Swiss psychiatrist, is leading out in a return to a theological conception of marriage. He holds that it is high time for Protestants to effect this return; for in his judgment marriage has "fallen a victim to the biologists, and suffered a worse fate still by falling into the hands of the moralists." There is no question in our mind but that in the American setting marriage has fallen into the hands also of the psychologist and the sociologist. The author suggests the three aspects of marriage, sex, eros, and love. These, of course, come from the insights that thology has contributed. They offer the only possible unifying center for all who are dealing with the marriage problem.

The Swiss doctor writes in a style of kindliness that will lead many readers to say, "I would like to talk with him in person." Others will consider him much too naive. The fact remains that 100,000 copies of this book have been sold in Europe, truly indicative of a popular response. Sales in America should be no less.

Paul M. Lindberg

*Evangelism for Tomorrow.* By Charles B. Templeton. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1957.

In the preface of this book the author expresses his purpose in these words: "It is my hope that the things learned across the past twenty years and here inscribed will contribute to a better understanding of that most frequently misunderstood and most abused aspect of the church's ministry . . . Evangelism."

The author has fulfilled his intent with fresh and incisive vigor. Beginning with a frank appraisal of our contemporary situation in the world in which the church is at work, he discusses the function and place of a sound and healthy evangelism.

We recommend the book heartily to pastors and lay people. The promise, the risks, the opportunities and aims of a Scripture-centered evangelism are lucidly and forcefully set forth. It will help the pastor in his preaching. It will counsel the layman to get his heart, hands, and feet on what is basic church work in ours and every age.

A. S. Tanner

*Creative Giving.* By Hiley H. Ward. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1958. 170 pages. $3.75.

What shall be said of a book that in this day in American Protestant church life takes an uncompromising position against the growing practice of tithing, urges that we should "throw out the word 'stewardship,'" and pleads that we "be stingy for Christ's sake?" Having assured ourselves, as we quickly may, that it is more than a cynical diatribe or irresponsible iconoclasm, it seems to me we owe it to the author to find out just what he's driving at. In this case it certainly proves rewarding.

Mr. Ward begins by giving us a broadly descriptive definition of what "creative giving" means. His thesis is that God gave and gives creatively and therefore man must give responsively, creatively, and responsibly—that if a man lives in love he cannot but give in love and his giving will therefore of necessity be characterized by freedom, immediacy, and spontaneity. The new man must give in a new way!

The second chapter "What's Wrong with Proportionate Giving?" is the longest of the book and is most interesting. It is here that tithing (and proportionate giving of any sort) is studied and found wanting. Mr. Ward recognizes that tithing as an idea predominates on the American scene and is predominately an American practice. But he counts it a basically nomistic church financing "fad" for which the greatest claim is that it works. Upon critical examination he finds that it is not directly connected with the legal tithes of the Levites or the feudalistic tithes of the Middle Ages, that it stems neither from history nor revelation and has made its way as a result of lay pressures and pragmatic success even though it violates many ideals and principles. Of the Lutheran churches he says that they are the "greatest if not the only restrictive force on tithing today."

So far as his own plea for spontaneity in giving goes, it must be said that he faces up to virtually all the arguments that may be brought against the program. Yet he maintains that it is not only defensible but essential, once it is recognized that "creative giving" involves a commitment that is personal and truly total, and he challenges us to "living at a minimum so that we can give a maximum."

While "almost persuaded," your reviewer finds himself fearful that spontaneity leans to the impractical and is likely for most Christians to result in spasmodic or sentimental giving with dire results for the regular support of the routine operations of the church. Yet he cannot help but wistfully wish it were in him to support the program whole-heartedly.

The book is a definitely informed, competent, and up-to-date study. Its documentation is extensive and Lutherans will note with interest references to the LWF, the NLC, the ULCA, the LFC, the ELC, the LLM, Drs. Kantonen, Engelbrecht, and Raymond Olson, Bishops Berggrav and Giertz, Finnish Miss Eira Paunu, Yasuzumi Eto, K. Ephraim Amos, and Luther himself. Tithers will not be too pleased with it though some may be ready to accept its novel and creative suggestions. Anti-tithers will hail it but are not too likely to "follow through

n the more excellent way. Some Christians ho earnestly seek and desire a new direc- ve and are ready to be challenged will find at challenge in the call for a complete mmitment—which is what most of us lack —of time, intelligence, and resources.

HENRY H. BAGGER

*he Liturgy and the Christian Faith.* By Massey H. Shepherd, Jr. Greenwich, Conn.: The Seabury Press, 1957. 49 pages. 95 cents.

This is a pamphlet written by an Anglican nd directed to the Anglican church. How- ver, it deals with a subject which touches ne church catholic, and therefore is worth- hile reading for any churchman. This is articularly true in the current era of cumenical awareness.

The author writes in a direct, unam- iguous style. Particularly good are the hapters in which he discusses the history nd meaning of the festival of Easter as the riginal core of the liturgy, and the Chris- an Year and its significance for the Chris- an. His words here are worth quoting: It is a means whereby the church so lives n time, that it takes hold of the eternal life hat is given it in Christ."

Other chapters deal with the history of he Liturgical Movement; Christian Initi- tion, a discussion of Baptism and Confirma- ion; the Eucharist; and the Daily Offices, n which he elaborates on the value of the se of the Psalter. A brief, selected bibli- graphy closes the work. Its 47 pages allow ne to gain a knowledge of its contents in n hour or two of relatively easy but en- rossing reading.

GERHARD M. CARTFORD

*Prayer Book Interleaves.* By William Palmer Ladd. Greenwich, Conn.: The Seabury Press, 1957. 193 pages. $1.75.

This book is a collection of short essays, written during the 1930's by the Rev. William Palmer Ladd, until his death in 1941 Dean of the Berkeley Divinity School in New Haven.

As the title suggests, these essays are written as a commentary on the *Anglican Book of Common Prayer* and the accompanying liturgical usages within the Anglican-Episcopalian communion. In a chapter entitled, The Next 150 Years, Dean Ladd draws up something like a summary of his thoughts. He feels that the Book of Common Prayer is an admirable service book, but he thinks some changes could be made in order to bring it up to date. Among them: make the Eucharist the goal of the Sunday service; cherish catholic tradition but interpret rubrics liberally; eliminate historical accretions of doubtful value—such as the "last Gospel"; revise the calendar and the lectionary; reintroduce the use of psalms, introits and graduals; and, the most surprising, encourage communion in one kind only. This last he does not elaborate on at any length, unfortunately, so the reader is not treated to any theological arguments for eliminating the cup. His reasons seem to be purely practical—lack of time on Sunday morning.

This lack of any extended discussion is a distinct weakness in the book. The nature of these short essays precludes such discussion. Their chief value lies primarily in the terse, sometimes blunt, but illuminating presentation of ideas. Here speaks a churchman who has developed a keen eye for the ways of the church. His sense of history combines with a pastoral concern for the parish to present a balanced view of what congregational worship should be and what its importance is in the life of the Christian.

For this reason his words afford profitable reading for all. What he has to say applies equally well in many cases to communions other than the Episcopalians. He gives some pointed suggestions for the improvement of theological education.

The Lutheran reader might be somewhat taken aback by the short shrift which Dean Ladd gives Martin Luther's efforts at liturgical reform. However, even Lutherans are beginning to realize that Luther is not necessarily to be regarded any longer as the ultimate authority in matters liturgical.

The author expresses himself with that peculiarly Anglican gift, a blend of reverence and wit when dealing with liturgical affairs, which contrives to make its point without triggering heated and, on this subject, often fruitless argument.

GERHARD M. CARTFORD

*Christian Worship, Its History and Meaning*. By Horton Davies. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1957. 128 pages. $2.00.

The author has divided his book into three parts: the history of worship, the content of worship, and worship and life.

Half of the book (the better half in my judgment) is taken up with a historical presentation of the worship of the major communions: Orthodox, Roman Catholic, Lutheran, Anglican or Episcopalian, Presbyterian, Methodist, Congregational, Baptist, Quaker, as well as their common antecedents, temple, synagogue, and apostolic church. This part of the book is written with a fine grasp of the essential characteristics of each period and movement. With a few words the author gives a clear picture of the development, the strengths and weaknesses, the particular genius of each of the forms the liturgy has taken. Furthermore, the author, a Congregationalist, writes sympathetically about each one, and the reader can get as nearly an objective picture as it is possible to get of such a subject in such a brief discussion.

In the portion of the book titled, The Content of Worship, the reader is instructed in the author's conception of what ought to make up our worship. Here readers from various communions will probably find one area or another in which they will differ with the author's viewpoint, depending on the particular areas their own communions tend to emphasize. Some will undoubtedly want to challenge him on theological grounds, especially in his interpretation of the Lord's Supper.

The final portion of the book contains some helpful suggestions for the approach of the individual to worship, the most valuable of which is, to my mind, a strong emphasis on Christian worship as being essentially a corporate thing—the worship of the Body of Christ—for only interpreted in this way can it achieve its fullest reality.

The book is not written for the theologian. It is intended for the thoughtful Christian, lay or clergy, who would like to broaden the base of his liturgical perception. Although a more thoroughgoing appreciation on the part of the author for the total ramifications of the liturgy in the life of the church would have added to the substance of the book, I would not hesitate to recommend the book to a purchaser who does not limit the contents of his library on the subject of worship to this one volume. The author himself gives assistance at this point by including at the end of his book a short selected bibliography of other books on the subject.

GERHARD M. CARTFORD